WALES UNDER THE INDULGENCE

1672—1675

PEMBROKESHIRE EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

County Library.

Book No. 2/21590

Readers are requested to take great care of the books while in their possession, to protect them from rain, to point out any defects that they may observe in them to the Local Librarian, and not to turn down the corners of leaves

A Books should be returned to the Local Centre within fourteen days from date of issue, but an extension of the period of loan will be granted when desired.

Readers should report to the Local Librarian any case of infectious disease occurring in the house while a Library Book is in their possession.

Readers desiring special books of an advanced and expensive kind can borrow them from the National Library of Wales or from the Central Library for Students. Applications for these should be made to the County Librarian, County Offices, Haverfordwest.

274

PEMBROKESHIRE COUNTY LIBRARY

This Book may be kept for 14 days. £27

RESERVE

FEB. 23 1932		
DEC. 20 1935		
FEB. 11 1936		
JUNE 22 1937		
FEB. 15 1938		
AUG. 14 1939		
MAY 24 1949		
10. MAR 1953		

WITHDRAWN FROM PLS

WALES UNDER THE INDULGENCE

CYNYRCHION YR EISTEDDFOD GENEDLAETHOL (*See* PAGE IX)
O dan Olygiaeth E. Vincent Evans (Vinsent)

WALES
UNDER THE
INDULGENCE
(1672—1675)

BY
THOMAS RICHARDS, M.A., D.LITT.,
LIBRARIAN, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF
NORTH WALES, BANGOR

PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL EISTEDDFOD ASSOCIATION,
CHANCERY LANE, LONDON
1928

PRINTED (FOR THE ASSOCIATION) BY
WESTERN MAIL LIMITED, CARDIFF

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY NOTE - - - - ix

AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION - - - xi–xix

CHAPTER I.

WELSH PURITANISM - - - - 1–28
(i) 1639-1660.
(ii) 1660-1662.

Note : Gwydir Evidence.

CHAPTER II.

THE PENAL CODE - - - - 29–35
Engines of Uniformity—The Strength of the Weak—Faith and Figures—The Anglican Inquisition—Tests of Conscience.

CHAPTER III.

WINTER'S HARVEST - - - - 36–43
Henry Coleman—Concordats—Rhydwilym —Submergence—The Quaker Assimilation —The Language Barrier—Puritan Resiliency—The Contact with Bristol—Borders.

CHAPTER IV.

NUMBERS - - - - - 44–48
The Fallacies of a Professor—Correctives—The Cradock Tradition—Vavasor's Personality—A Forecast of Difficulties.

CHAPTER V.

A ROYAL TACTICIAN - - - 49–55
Accommodation—Facing Both Ways—Dispensing Power—The School of Robartes —Caballers.

CHAPTER VI. PAGE

THE ROMANIST FACTOR - - - - 56–61
The Discoveries of Lord Acton—Petitions—The Diplomacy of Arlington—Conflicting Issues.

CHAPTER VII.

HOPES AND FEARS - - - - - 62–68
Interviews—Three Rogues?—Cases of Conscience—Strange Accusations—Stranger Theories.

CHAPTER VIII.

TEXT - - - - - - 69–71

CHAPTER IX.

INTERPRETATION - - - - - 72–87
The Ambit of Freedom—Arlington and his Clerks—Licences Particular—Licences General.

CHAPTER X.

INTERPRETATION—*continued* - - - 88–99
Whitehall's Goodwill—Some Checks and Disappointments—The Declaration and the Church Courts—The Declaration and the Five Mile Act.
Note: Tanner MS. 146, ff. 138–138v.

CHAPTER XI.

LICENCE AGENTS - - - - - 100–114
Their Rise—Welshmen and Others—The Building of a Table—Fees and Formalities.
Note: Beirniad, 1912, 179.

CHAPTER XII.

GENERAL TEACHERS - - - - - 115–128
The Welsh Five—The Case of Daniel Williams—The Term Misapplied—Religious Trespassers.
Note: Jones MS. 22 (p. 118).

CHAPTER XIII.

THE DIARY OF HENRY MAURICE - - 129–142
Liberty or Licence ?—'Enlargement of Spirit'—A Divided Family—With the Gunmen—The Conformable Clergy—Settlement in the South.

CHAPTER XIV.

ORDINARY LICENCES: NORTH WALES - - 143–153
Note: The Mystery of Bodvel House (p. 144).

CHAPTER XV.

ORDINARY LICENCES: SOUTH WALES - - 154–162

CHAPTER XVI.

ORDINARY LICENCES: OVER THE BORDER · 163–168
Near the Dyke—Further Afield.

CHAPTER XVII.

UNLICENSED SCHOOLS - - - - 169–179
'Spite of Law and Coercion'—The Man at the Window—Surmises—Samuel Jones—North Welshmen—A List of Schools—The Charity Movement.
Note: The Genesis of a Great Idea.

CHAPTER XVIII.

WELSH PRESBYTERIANS - - - 180–194
Frustrated Ideals—'Growing to Independents'—Abiding Convictions—The Whitehall Clerks Again—A Process of Elimination—Three Morgannwg Men—Philip Henry—Was Charles Edwards a Presbyterian ?

CHAPTER XIX.

PAGE

BAPTISTS IN DISGUISE - - - - 195–208
Bunyan's Attitude—The Llantrisant School —The Penyrwrlodd Family—'Baptists for the Most Part'—Thomas Tonman—Captain Jenkin Jones—Congregational v. Independent—Summary.

Note: Barzillai Jones, Dean of Lismore.

CHAPTER XX.

THE ARMINIAN DÉBACLE - - - 209–215
An Isolated Group—Friends—William Greene and Thomas Evans—Signs of Life —Evanescence.

CHAPTER XXI.

DIFFICULTIES OF ESTIMATION - - - 216–225
Many Voices—Addresses of Thanks—Baptist Misgivings—'The Phanaticks Would not Believe'—Licences Unrepresentative —Individual and Congregation.

CHAPTER XXII.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS - - - 226–238
New Life and Leaders—The Dominant Sects—Food for Pessimism—Puritan Continuity—Social Status—Varieties of Experience—Irreconcilables.

Note: Barbara Williams of Newport (p. 230).

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE BREAKING OF THE BROAD SEAL - - 239–250
Drums Ecclesiastic—The Nones of March —A Bill of Ease—Respite—Revocation.

Note: A Surviving Licence.

INDEX OF PERSONS, &C. - 251–256

INDEX OF PLACES - 257–261

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

In the course of the years, from 1920 to 1925, the author of this volume has published through the National Eisteddfod Association a series of studies dealing with the religious history of Wales in the seventeenth century. They include "A History of the Puritan Movement in Wales from the Institution of the Church at Llanvaches in 1639 to the Expiry of the Propagation Act in 1653"; "Religious Developments in Wales from 1654 to 1662"; and "Wales under the Penal Code, 1662 to 1687." These works received the highest award of merit at the National Eisteddfod, and were published by the Eisteddfod Association as worthy productions of our national institution. The present volume is a separate work, and was not sent in for competition in the ordinary way; but as it continues to treat the subject that was dealt with in the volumes already mentioned, and in the same careful and exhaustive manner, the Eisteddfod Association has deemed it well to undertake its publication, and to add it to the series containing Dr. Thomas Richards' interesting and enlightening story of The Puritan Movement in Wales. To Dr. Richards, the Association desires to tender its grateful thanks for the result of many years of laborious research, and for the scrupulous attention he has given to the passing of his work through the press.

E. VINCENT EVANS,

Honorary Secretary to the

National Eisteddfod Association.

INTRODUCTION.

This work is a continuation of the author's previous studies in the religious history of Wales in the 17th century—one dealing with Welsh Puritanism up to the expiry of the Propagation Act, another taking the story from the appointment of the Triers to the passing of the Act of Uniformity in 1662, and a third dealing with the incidence of the Penal Code from 1662 to 1687.[1] Indeed, its opening chapter is in many respects a re-statement of their conclusions ; but in these and cognate matters it also contains a considerable amount of new research. In these works emphasis was laid on the English affinities of early Welsh Puritanism, on the unreadiness of the Welsh peasant to accept the strange gospels thrust upon him by preachers from over the Border or by Welshmen who had spent a forced sojourn in England. Yet it had to be admitted that a powerful minority of Welshmen had helped in the agitation for the Propagation Act—an Act which gave Wales for three years practical autonomy in its religious affairs—and that several Welshmen found seats upon the panel of Puritan Triers sitting in London.

Wales had no such share in shaping the policy of the Indulgence of 1672. While it is true that some men with Welsh associations sat in the King's Council which decided to publish the Declaration, it is equally true that not one of them represented the feelings either of the fiery Welsh Anglican or of the pugnacious Welsh Dissenter. And whether that document is to be looked upon as a product of Shaftesbury's fertile brain or as emanating from the King himself in pursuance of a deeply-laid Romanist scheme, it sprang from

1 All three were published under the auspices of the National Eisteddfod Association (1920, 1923, 1925).

the purlieus of Whitehall, the whole apparatus of its administration was set up in the Earl of Arlington's lodgings. Welsh Dissenters had to take their chances of getting licences with those who lived nearer to the centre of things. The days of autonomy were long past. Therefore any difficulties of interpretation that arise, any problems of terminology that present themselves—all have to find their bases of analogy in England. This explains the apparently disproportionate place given in this work to developments in the capital and to the fortunes of nonconformists east of Offa's Dyke. To look upon Wales of the Indulgence as a separate entity would be fatal.

It follows almost of necessity that English writers have overshadowed those of Wales in dealing with this tangled period. Nor have those Welsh historians who have essayed to follow them been very fortunate in their endeavours. Considering the limitations of his age and training, Dr. Thomas Rees of Swansea did excellent work in his *History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales* (1883). But the five pages (177-181) devoted by him to the nonconformist licences are on a very low level indeed : what is to be thought of a man who says William Thomas was licenced at Llantrisant (Mon.) in 1672 when (according to Joshua Thomas) that noteworthy Baptist had passed away in 1671 ? Page 203 of the *Entry Book* has it that it was George Robinson who was allowed to preach there.[1] Some years later the versatile journalist Mr Beriah Evans published his *Diwygwyr Cymru* and gave three pages (172-175) to the licences. His list is surely longer than the Doctor's and his notes contain many ingenious surmises about place-names ; but he is content to copy out his predecessor's mistake concerning William Thomas, and to find a Jeremy Walter licenced at a place called Llandaud—the State Papers know nothing of either man or place ! When it has to be

1 It is rather a peculiar thing to say that the references to the documents of 1672-1673 in *Hanes Eglwysi Annibynol Cymru*—four volumes compiled by Drs. Thomas Rees and John Thomas between 1871 and 1875—are far more exact than the lists given by Dr. Thomas Rees in his revised *History* of 1883.

said that the mistakes referred to here (both of Dr. Rees and of Mr. Beriah Evans) are a mere fraction of their total delinquencies, it can be readily seen how unworthily the records of 1672-1673 have been dealt with. One would have thought that the comparatively few Baptist licences would receive ample justice at the hands of Dr. Spinther James, especially when he tells us that he commissioned a fellow Baptist to call at the Public Record Office and copy them out carefully ; between them they made a fearful bungle of the Llangennech group on pp. 251, 260, of the *Entry Book*, and of the Abergavenny-Bedwellty entries on pp. 231, 232. In quite a different class are the transcripts of the Welsh licences contributed by the late Principal J. H. Davies to the *Traethodydd* of Sept. 1901 (vol. lvi, pp. 321-334). These have been made with that care and circumspection one associates with all his work. In a few cases only is the present writer compelled to disagree with him : he strangely omitted the one relevant entry concerning Daniel Williams of Wrexham (*infra*, p. 120), and supplied the hiatus in the Talgarth licence of William Watkins in such a way as to bring into being a new Puritan teacher of whom there is no other contemporary evidence (*infra*, p. 154). Subsidiary errors are the date of Milman's licence for Llangwm (23 July for 25), the pagination of the Caldicot entry (181 for the 187 of the *Entry Book*), and the pagination of several licences issued to the Baptists and Independents of North Monmouth (231 for 232).

About the same time Mr. Blackburne Daniell was writing his preface to the *Calendar of State Papers* for 1672-1673, in which he devoted 28 pages (xxxvi-lxiv) to analyse the contents of the *Entry Book* 38*A*. All the licences were meticulously tabulated under counties and conveniently arranged under the sect-descriptions of the licencees. Unfortunately, no effort was made to penetrate beneath the surface of the documents and test the entries of the clerks

in the light of the previous history of the Puritan preachers and householders. Prominent Independents were allowed to remain under the term *Presbyterian;* free-communion Baptists of the Bunyan school were herded together as *Congregationals.* Thus he arrives at the preposterous result that the Baptists of Wales in 1672-1673 had only nine licenced teachers (xliv-xlv). His treatment of Wales also suffered from a failure to appreciate considerations both of history and geography; else he would not suggest that Mary *Lloyd* of *Cynfal* was licenced at *Cynwyd* (*C.S.P.*, 1672, p. 379). Nor did he make matters easier by dissociating Monmouth from the other twelve counties. Generally speaking, the principality had but scant justice at the hands of this acute and learned calendarist.

Frank Bate is the modern writer who has specifically addressed himself to examine this interlude in our religious story. His work appeared in 1908. There is nothing but admiration for the suggestive preface by Sir Charles Firth and for the 100 lucid pages of introductory matter given by the author. Regarding his appendices and the references there to Wales, another tale must be told: they are often vitiated by unscientific guesses as to the locality of meeting-places, and by a tendency to extend unnecessarily the application of the *general* licence. It is to be regretted that Alexander Gordon has not given us a volume on the Indulgence issues. No religious student of our time can touch almost any phase of post-Reformation history with greater exactness of detail or apply to it a surer grasp of basic principles. He is thoroughly at home in all the documents that grew around the Declaration; as late as 20 January, 1923, he had a very informing address in *Christian Life* on the Nottingham licencees. And there is a wealth of reference in the *Freedom after Ejection* which was published by him in 1917.

The late Professor George Lyon Turner deserves a paragraph all his own. His three volumes of *Original Records*

threw a flood of light on nonconformity 'under persecution and indulgence.' He put all students of the decade after 1662 immensely in his debt. With the results of his labours before them, they are able to follow new and ever newer trails of research; for example, it was in the preface to his first volume I first heard of the religious census of 1676 and the *Salt MS.* at Stafford. That first volume is a triumph of accurate transcription, the second of toilsome analysis, while the third—'historical and expository'—presents to its readers wonderful facts of scholarly discovery. The writer has tested his transcriptions at all points concerning Wales and the Border: it is only on f. 186b of the *Lambeth MS.* 639 that he found the name of the St. Bride's householder in 1669 incorrectly copied, and a bracket wrongly drawn (*O.R.*, i, 45). He also forgot to mark off with deleting crosses a Monmouth entry in *S.P. 321*, 353. Very naturally, the second volume afforded more open flanks for attack; in its summaries several entries found in vol. i are either omitted or misapplied. It is in vol. iii (pp. 338, 340, n.†) that he makes the curious slip of describing Gower as 'little England beyond Wales.' This last volume is one mass of interest and information. Readers of this present work will very soon see that the writer profoundly disagrees with the late Professor, in some cases over matters of fact, in more cases over matters of interpretation. But neither the little slips he made nor my deep disagreement with some of his conclusions have detracted in the least from the admiration I have for the man and his work. Early in 1923, quite in ignorance of his death, I addressed to him a letter of inquiry, only to receive from his widow the kindliest of notes to say that he had been called to higher service in August, 1920, and that he lay buried in the churchyard of South Hayling in Hampshire. In that grave rests one of the most resolute and gallant benefactors of Nonconformist history.

Notwithstanding the accident to the bracket and the absence of the deleting crosses, I give the greatest trust to the transcripts of his first volume. The upshot is that all references in the footnotes (with the exceptions to be noted presently) to the *Entry Book* and *S.P. 320* and *321* have been quoted from that volume. Honest dealing in research demands that to be distinctly understood. All the Welsh entries, all the Border entries, all references to Welshmen in England—these I have examined for myself at the Public Record Office. It would be too great a compliment to the English basis of the Indulgence to compel a Welshman, in order to get some light on the working of the Declaration in the principality, to examine every application, receipt and licence appertaining to the forty counties of England. Especially when they were supplied ready to his hand by one of the most careful and conscientious of copyists.

A few words about writers of a type more general and less concentrative. Those who have the patience to wade through the *Account* and *Continuation* of Calamy will be occasionally rewarded by very authoritative news on the working of the Indulgence ; the same is true of those later traditions preserved by Samuel Palmer in his *Nonconformist Memorial.* Welshmen read these works with the greater confidence because Calamy's reminiscences were reinforced by James Owen of Oswestry and Palmer's later editions checked and corrected by Joshua Thomas of Leominster. This reference to Joshua Thomas induces the further remark that he was something very much more than the corrector of Palmer. For equanimity of temper, for cautious and unbiased judgment, he still takes the first place amongst historians of religion in Wales. His thin ears caught the sound of every tradition of the Vavasorian age that floated in the heavy air of the 18th century. Though Joshua says but little of the licences and hardly makes an effort to distinguish between the various schools of Baptists, his *Hanes y Bedyddwyr* is invaluable as a background for the

character and doings of the Baptist licencees. To get a general conspectus of Baptist history and a particular account of their attitude towards Indulgences, we must turn to the pages of our contemporary Dr. W. T. Whitley. For a philosophic analysis of the diverse factors that made for toleration in an age of intolerance, one cannot do better than examine the arguments of A. A. Seaton and H. F. Russell Smith, two Cambridge men of this generation. Their works are not rendered less attractive by the large spirit of tolerance with which they discuss the coming of toleration.

In the past, research into the lot of Welsh Dissenters, both of Bartolomeans and of the younger school of Bronyclydwr, has been delayed by a fatalistic belief in the paucity of records, by a certain incompetence in dealing with those which had been discovered, and by a very pronounced disinclination to walk up boldly to the doors of the public archives. With the result, in the 19th century more especially, that our religious annals had become the favourite haunts of rhetorical repetitioners, of vain weavers of fancy, of men who seemed to fit well with Virgil's mysterious line—

seraque terrifici cecinerunt omnia vates.

Most fortunately, the period 1672-1675 has been saved from the mercies of these modern seers by Philip Henry and Henry Maurice, two men very diverse in temperament, at opposite poles in their ideals of church-government—two Puritans of the deepest dye, and two who kept diaries. Twelve pages of Henry's private papers are first-class evidence of the activities of a licenced minister; Maurice's 'little diary' tells us how Salop licences did duty in the remote peninsula of Lleyn. And the latter's letter of 1675, preserved as *Addenda B* in the Underhill edition of the *Broadmead Records*, describes the state of nonconformity in Wales just after the licences of 1672 were finally revoked by the influence of Archbishop Sheldon. From the Anglican standpoint the

letter written early in 1673 by Bishop William Lucy of St. David's to the same Sheldon is of the utmost value, introducing as it does the names of Stephen Hughes and John Weaver, and reflecting the views of the most intransigent of Welsh bishops at a time when writs, warrants, and episcopal informers had all fallen into a strange desuetude (*Tanner MS.* 146, ff. 138-138v).

I have once more to express my sincerest thanks to the guardians of our MS. repositories for their unwearying kindness :—

(i) to the authorities of the British Museum and the Public Record Office,

(ii) to the Librarian at Lambeth Palace,

(iii) to Bodley's Librarian and the Keeper of the Archives,

(iv) to the Chief Librarian and the other officials of the National Library of Wales,

(v) to the Governors of the William Salt Library at Stafford.

The staff of Dr. Williams' Library in Gordon Square have continued to send works of reference with great promptness, an inestimable boon for one who lived in a district somewhat remote from large libraries. So also have the N.L.W. in forwarding duplicate copies. I feel very grateful to both institutions. Information supplied by other gentlemen will be found acknowledged at various points in the course of the work.

All the authorities are quoted in the footnotes. For those that are unwieldy or inordinately long, the following abbreviations have been found convenient. The opportunity is taken to give a short description of the contents of one or two of them.

Bate .. .. The Declaration of Indulgence (1672): A Study in the Rise of Organised Dissent, by Frank Bate, M.A., B.Litt. (1908).

C.S.P.	Calendar of State Papers.
Diaries	The Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry, ed. M. H. Lee (1882).
D.N.B.	Dictionary of National Biography.
E.B.	State Paper Domestic, Charles II, Entry Book 38A. The record of the licences (but not the actual documents) as written up by Francis Benson and other clerks.
H.P.M.	A History of the Puritan Movement in Wales from 1639 to 1653, by Thomas Richards (1920).
O.R.	Original Records of Early Nonconformity under Persecution and Indulgence, by Prof. G. Lyon Turner, M.A. (1911, 1914). Vol. i, Text; ii, Summaries; iii, Historical and Expository.
Propagators, .. *Propagation.* ..	General terms for the autonomous jurisdiction of the Commissioners and Approvers under the Propagation Act for Wales (1650-1653). Great vigour and austerity are implied.
R.D.W.	Religious Developments in Wales (1654-1662), by Thomas Richards (1923).
S.P. 320 & 321.	State Papers Domestic, Charles II, Nos. 320, 321. Memoranda of licence-forms, licence-applications, acknowledgments of receipt, petitions, addresses of thanks to the King. Confidential letters of Dr. Nicholas Butler to Sir Joseph Williamson. Col. Thomas Blood's demand for fees.

WALES UNDER THE INDULGENCE.

I.

WELSH PURITANISM.

(i) 1639-1660

Wales did not take kindly to the Puritan movement. At no time did the 'gathered churches' number more than a mere minority of the population: if Vavasor Powell did assure the millenarian Rogers that 20,000 saints were ready to hazard their blood in destroying the un-Christ-like Protectorate of Cromwell, he must have been indulging in extravagant rhetoric[1]; and when allowance is made for a fifteen years' persecution, it is difficult to explain how the 7,000 Welsh Puritans of 1660 (a number arrived at by a rough averaging of Powell's statements in prison[2]) could have shrunk down to a little over 4,000 in the spring of 1676.[3] Puritanism was not racy of the soil. Though the origins of the Baptists of Olchon and the early energies of Wroth at Llanfaches are even yet involved in some obscurity, it is in the highest degree unlikely that they were spontaneous movements; what is known for certain is that the historic congregation at the latter place was instituted in 1639, on the New England pattern, and that by an Englishman from London.[4] From then onwards Puritan influences came rushing headlong into Gwent along the line of Antonine's xivth Itinerary; hand-in-hand with the English language, the new English ideas moved up to the Severn hinterland as far as Llangurig; no one is surprised that before long Cradock could say that the new gospel ran along the lower Marches like flames in thatch.[5]

1 *Gweithiau Morgan Llwyd* (ed. J. H. Davies), ii, Introdn., lxx and n.†.
2 *Bird in Cage Chirping*, 'brief narrative of the former Propagation,' p. 8 (1661 edn.).
3 *Salt MS.* (Stafford), returns of Archbp. Sheldon's census.
4 Wm. Erbery: *Apocrypha*, p. 8; *Testimony*, pp. 162-163.
5 *Glad Tydings*, p. 50

This fiery movement was soon to be regulated by a Committee for Plundered Ministers sitting in London, a body of men who approved or appointed over 130 ministers for evangelical work in Wales; after them came the Welsh Commissioners for the Propagation—of whom, nevertheless, a good third were Englishmen—to make men moral by the bayonets of soldiers and the writs of sheriffs; finally, came no less than three successive boards of Triers, and keen is the eye that can discover more than one or two Welshmen sitting among them. The powerful panel of Trustees for Maintenance of Ministers (like the Triers, with headquarters in the capital), who controlled the forfeited revenues of the bishops and chapters, and who found the money for a considerable number of ministers and all Puritan schoolmasters in Wales, boasted not a single Welshman as member.

Never was Wales more at the mercy of English soldiers and English committees. Englishmen appeared everywhere, in spheres secular and spiritual: if a worthy ex-Principal of Jesus, expelled from Oxford by the new Puritan regulators, sought refuge at Llantrithyd in Glamorgan and had his cassock 'ript and toare' until it dangled from his girdle in small threads, it was an English preaching farrier named Clements who did the outrage[1]; after Thomas Bassett was ejected from the vicarage of Llantrisant in the same county, a trooper came to live in the vicarage-house for three years with the un-Cymric name of Thomas Tryman (or Trueman)[2]; when the episcopal interests in the lordship of Pebidiog were put up for sale at the beginning of 1652, they were struck down to a Saxon named Humphrey Hill for a little over £2,400[3]; a Parliamentary captain named Thomas Swift superintended the traffic from Holyhead to Dublin. And far too much credence was given at Whitehall to the reports of English generals like Fleetwood and Cooper, reports upon Welsh developments made as they passed to and fro from Ireland. But we must hasten to add that this dominance of the Englishman was due less to deliberate policy than to the play of military accident and to the fact that all Puritan roads branched out from London. Not one of the great

1 E. G. Hardy: *Jesus College*, pp. 115-116.
2 *MS. J. Walker*, c. 4, f. 65b.
3 *Bodl. MS. Rawlinson*, B. 239, p. 55, No. 596 (conveyance dated 13 Feb., 1651-1652).

Parliamentary committees can be rightly accused of treating Welsh as a ' little language.' Even the ' mouse-trap makers '[1] of the Westminster Assembly of Divines (Christopher Love was the nearest approach to a Welshman who ever attended their deliberations) more than once were very much concerned with sending out preachers to Wales who could preach in the native tongue[2]; the Plundered Ministers' Committee saw to it that Welsh should not be ignored at Llanbadarn and Abergavenny[3]; the Committee for the Regulation of the Universities made especial provision for a Welsh preacher at Oswestry[4]; and there were English-speaking ministers who exercised their discretion in refusing the invitations of Vavasor Powell and other Propagators to come and settle in Wales[5] (a form of courage that could well be imitated by some of the Trier nominees). But when all this is said, and albeit John Griffith of Llanddyfnan was referring to English cornets and colonels only, he had plenty of justification in bewailing the ' dim Cymraeg ' of the new English conquerors.

Besides founding over 60 free schools in the market towns and on the countryside, these various committees stocked the principality with nearly 400 ministers more or less satisfactory to Puritan standards. That is their abiding glory. Unfortunately, an Anglican pamphleteer said that there were in 1654 no less than 700 parishes unsupplied with any preacher on the Lord's Day.[6] To that statement no effective rebutter was ever given. The Propagators had introduced a picturesque itinerant system which was at first discontinued by the Triers; the latter also, more particularly in Pembroke and Cardigan, had attempted to bring a number of neighbouring parishes under one central pastorate; concurrent with this, the old itinerant system was allowed to re-appear, coupled with a modified practice of Puritan pluralism, a practice which allowed Heads of Oxford colleges to hold sinecure rectories at Abergele and Llanrhaiadr ym Mochnant. Monoglot Englishmen filled the Llandinam comportions, and committed the old sin of non-residence by hardly ever

1 For the story of this peculiar epithet, see *Wood's Life and Times* (ed. Clark), i, 425.
2 *H.P.M.*, pp. 45, 79.
3 *ib.*, p. 43.
4 *Sion College MS.* A.R.C., L 40/2, E. 16, f. 439 (order of 22 Jan., 1650-1651).
5 *Bird in Cage Chirping*, p. 41.
6 Alexander Griffith: *Strena Vavasoriensis*, p. 5.

appearing there. An interesting character, the Thomas Jones of Oswestry who was Fellow of University College in Oxford, was allowed to enter upon the rectory of Castell Caereinion before he had a good working knowledge of the Welsh language, 'and yet not a third part of the people understands any English.'[1] Unbearded youths were intruded into parishes, a scandal much to the heart of a quasi-Anglican high sheriff of Brecknock[2]; and the general paucity of preachers draws down the anger of a Puritan major-general like Berry, who asks Secretary Thurloe to dun the ears of Walter Cradock and Dr. John Owen on the question, two important members of the first board of Triers.[3] And notwithstanding the accession of new blood like Samuel Jones at Llangynwyd and Stephen Hughes at Mydrim, the average type of minister approved was so little to the liking of learned clergy like Dr. John Ellis of Dolgelley and equally learned laymen like John Lewis of Glasgrug as to make the two conceive the idea of a Welsh College for the training of ministers,[4] an idea no doubt also impelled to some extent by the woful failure of Jesus College in Oxford—demoralised by the vendetta between its cantankerous Principal and the opportunist Fellows who dwelt in that society[5]—to divert educated Puritans to fill the empty churches of their native land.

Over such a world of deficiencies Anglican writers waxed satiric both in prose and verse—Alexander Griffith over the vagaries of the Vavasorian gospel, Edward Dafydd of Margam over the horde of itinerants, paid and unpaid. Even the third Calamy, the Nonconformist historian of St. Bartholomew, reveals his English prejudice and his Presbyterian snobbery in drawing a distinction between those who were silenced in the 'extremities' of Wales (whatever that may mean) and those ejected in England[6]; while Anthony Wood, revelling in Restoration gossip over the pewter pot or avidly quoting the salacious words of Anglican tracts, thinks that many of the poor Welsh preachers were more fit to rub horse-heels

1 For proof of this, examine *Lambeth Aug. Bk.* 997, ii, 168; J. C. Morrice: *Wales*, p. 207; *Tanner MS.* 34, f. 31.
2 Dr. John Walker: *Sufferings*, i, 160-161, 163.
3 *Thurloe St. Papers*, iv, 565 (letter from Brecon, 28 Feb., 1655-1656).
4 *H.P.M.*, p. 233 (and nn. 10, 11).
5 For more on this point, see the writer's paper on the *Principalship of Dr. Michael Roberts* (*Trans. Hon. Soc. of Cymmrodorion*, 1922-1923, more esp. pp. 20-90).
6 *Account* (1713), ii, Preface, xv; also p. 735.

than to enter into a pulpit.[1] As an ejected minister who had felt the heavy hand of the Puritan revolution, Alexander Griffith was full of bias and dipped his pen in gall. But he did certainly know what he was talking about. Sober history has blunted the edge of the *Strena Vavasoriensis* and its tremendous indictments. There remains, however, a considerable residuum which Puritan historians have to reckon with very seriously. The issues between him and Vavasor are not to be solved by unscientific applause on the one hand, or by a scornful turn of the lip on the other.

Comparatively few as their numbers were, a goodly number of these few unequipped with an ordered corpus of theology, it behoved the Puritan ministers to be knit together in an organic unity bent upon preaching a simple gospel suited to the imperfect development of the peasantry. Surely they should not break too suddenly and too completely with the more decorous usages of the Anglican Church. Gloomy iconoclasm had failed to satisfy the soul of a Puritan like John Lewis of Cardiganshire : in 1646 nothing would do for him but to ridicule the superstitious survivals of the Romish faith among his countrymen and compare the service of the Prayer Book to the light of the moon which pales before the open sunshine of the gospel[2] ; ten years later, in a letter to Baxter, he regrets exceedingly how the light and traditions of the 'Universall church' have been obscured by 'o^r^ endeavouringe to become Antipodes in every thinge to it.' Everywhere, he says, were the Scriptures abused and pastors mistaken ; could not the divine of Kidderminster bring out a book to teach the new preachers sober good sense ? "They once gained, the erringe vulgar (like a herd) would soon be whistled in."[3] Writing books, indeed, was no difficulty with Baxter ; as to whistling, Lewis ought to know that the whole country already reverberated with the voices of ecstatic Stentors. What was one amongst so many ? Did not the geographical impact of England leave Wales at the mercy of any hot gospeller that came to the Border : Hanserd Knollys preaching adult baptism over the highlands of Brecknock and Radnor,[4] Jeremiah Ives propagating Arminianism in the

1 *Life and Times*, i. 292-293 (n. 6).
2 *The Parliament Explained to Wales* [Cymd. Llên Cymru Reprint], pp. 29, 30.
3 *Baxter Letters* (Dr. Williams' Library) ii, 128-129 (dated 25 May, 1656).
4 *MS. J. Walker*, c. 13, ff. 63b, 66.

upper reaches of the Wye,[1] William Rider advocating imposition of hands to the Baptists of the Hay,[2] Henry Jessey putting Llanfaches in order and re-baptising Vavasor Powell sixteen years later,[3] Anna Trapnell staggering the poor peasants with her prophecies of doom ?[4]

The actions and reactions of the new freedom, especially the roaring and sizzling of the mighty London melting-pot, have nowhere been so vividly described as by Morgan Llwyd in *Llyfr y Tri Aderyn :* his Raven does not know whether to desire for the raucous controversialists a new chamber in Tartarus or to divine them as animals running on hands and feet, with the hairs growing through them.[5] As if Llwyd himself was the one simple Welshman who had escaped scatheless from this war of words and the clash of conflicting opinions ! It was he who fused into classical Welsh the mystical tenets of the German Bœhme. Llwyd and Vavasor Powell both waxed meticulous over the imminent coming of the Lord to reign in person on earth. Down south (till his death in 1654) the irrepressible Erbery outlined in strange language his doctrine of the Third Dispensation ; soon the equally irrepressible Quakers would laugh to scorn the imperfect light of mystics and millenarians. Public debates became the order of the day. Sometimes Anglican broke lance with Puritan, as when Dr. George Griffith of Llanymynech and Vavasor Powell faced each other at Newchapel in Montgomery, and when Alexander Griffith indulged in verbal dialectic with the same Vavasor at Kington in Hereford, a demonstration in ungloved controversy well worth going far to see and hear (especially if we are to believe the word of Alexander that his doughty opponent was ' driven to a pinch ').[6] Shortly afterwards John Tombes entered the ring at Abergavenny to defend baptism by immersion against two Anglican opponents. More often Puritan challenged Puritan, as witness Erbery's disputes with David Davies at Llantrisant and with Henry Nicholls at Bridgend ; and the Babylonian Vavasor had to suffer the arrows of Zion shot against him

1 *R.D.W.*, p. 258.
2 *ib.*, pp. 187-188
3 *ib.*, pp. 214-215.
4 *ib.*, pp. 217-218. She seems to have stayed in Wales from Dec. 1655 to May 1656.
5 *Gweithiau*, I, 179-180.
6 *Strena Vavasoriensis*, p. 6.

at Knighton by Morgan Watkin the Quaker.[1] And it must always be borne in mind that one line of cleavage made Baptists either Calvinistic or Arminian, that another angle of vision made them 'open' or 'close.' Both Baptists and Independents divided into two schools over the question of State maintenance (there were close upon 70 unpaid preachers in South Wales alone), a divergence which naturally dovetailed into the larger controversy whether a worldly Protector deserved the homage of unworldly saints: was it not Vavasor Powell at the end of 1653 who put the portentous question at Blackfriars if Oliver Cromwell had come to reign instead of Jesus Christ?[2]

Virile debates and incendiary sermons had their counterpart in literary warfare in this golden age of the broadside and the pamphlet. Erbery's *Sword Doubled* was parried by Nicholls' *Shield Single;* the *Strena Vavasoriensis* was countered by the *Examen Vavasoris;* Powell's hymn at Christ Church led Alexander Griffith to write a scurrilous *Antiphona*[3]; the *Word for God* against the Protector was neutralised by the *Humble Address* in his favour; the infection of the Quakers demanded an *Antidote* from John Miles; and a provoking pamphlet sent by the Quakers of the south to Joshua Miller, the minister of St. Andrew's in Glamorgan, drew from that worthy 'a faithful discovery of their ways and opinions' in confutation of what he was pleased to call their 'dangerous and damnable Doctrines.'[4] This tale of dramatic antitheses reaches its anti-climax when Morgan Llwyd, after denouncing the taking of tithes as eating the bodies of the dead and in his Radnor sermon out-Vavasoring Vavasor in 'giveing him [the Protector] all the contempible words that can be spoaken,'[5] turns apostate at the end of 1656, and up to his death was in receipt of £100 a year in augmentation of the £43 natural revenue accruing to him from the living of Wrexham.[6] It is more than probable that before he passed away in 1659 the extremist Llwyd of 1654 had read with comparative appreciation the anagrams in

1 *The Perfect Life of the Sons of God vindicated,* 40 pp. (Salesbury Collection, U.C.S.Wales, Cardiff). This debate was held in September 1658.
2 *C.S.P.,* 1653-1654, p. 305.
3 *Strena,* p. 24.
4 *N.L.W., Commonwealth Tracts, Cat.,* pp. 65-66.
5 *Gweithiau,* i, 157; *Thurloe St. Pap.,* ii, 129.
6 *Lambeth Aug. Book* 987, ff. 200-201 [Entry B. 32]

praise of the dead Protector written by one of his compatriots named Thomas Davies.[1] Wales had become a wild welter of anomalies, the favourite asylum of spiritual paradox. Instead of union, the most wonderful diversities of disunion; instead of a simple gospel, no wind of doctrine passed unwelcomed. Puritan Wales did not lack for prophets. It was the logical complement of the priesthood of all believers.

Not that projects of union were unheard of amidst this religious anarchy. Major-General Harrison (the architect of the Propagation Act) writing to Colonel John Jones in November 1652 suggests that the latter should come to London to consult with the 'bretheren' (naming Powell, Cradock, and Jenkin Jones of Brecknock) as to the better propagation of the gospel; this consultation, however, was very evidently to be attended by prominent Puritans *outside Wales* as well, and had a very close connection with 'propagation' schemes then in agitation by the Rump.[2] Nor can the Llanbadarn conference organised by Vavasor Powell in 1656 be taken as a relevant factor in a policy of unification, as it was more in the nature of a political crusade against the Protectorate.[3] It was otherwise with the Ruthin meetings of 1658 described in the *Life* of Philip Henry, a somewhat belated adaptation of the principle of 'voluntary associations' conceived by Baxter in Worcestershire and by Richard Galpin in Cumberland. The saint of Worthenbury put it that correspondence was 'enlarged' with the ministers of North Wales for the promoting of unity, love, and good understanding among themselves and not excluding those of the episcopal judgment (he does not state whether they were ejected Anglicans or no). Henry was himself delegated to do the work of drawing up that part of the agreement which concerned the worship of God; in this document he laid stress on judging 'uniformily' on the circumstantials in order to remove those prejudices which many had conceived against religion itself, an attitude very much in common with that outlined to Baxter two years before by the Glasgrug layman of Cardiganshire. On doubtful points—'for those things

1 *Thomason Tract*, B.M.; referred to in *Catalogue of Commonwealth Tracts*, N.L.W., Introduction, vii.

2 For this development, see C. H. Simpkinson: *Life of Harrison*, App., pp. 293-294, 295-296; Dr. W. A. Shaw: *Hist. Eng. Church*, ii, 80-84 (and footnotes).

3 *Thurloe St. Pap.*, v, 112 (information from Gogerddan, 12 June).

wherein the Word is silent '—recourse was to be had to Christian prudence and to the practice of the Reformed Churches where it agreed with the general rule of the Word ; as a convinced Presbyterian he admits he had a ' special eye ' to the Directory drawn up by the Presbyterians of the Westminster Assembly.[1] Little is known of the progress made on these lines from 1658 to 1660. It is very certain that Dr. W. A. Shaw has confused the meetings of this new association with the ordinary assemblies of the Presbyterian classical system which flourished in English Flint from 1653 onwards.[2] It is equally certain that the Restoration laid a very dead hand on all these projects, and doomed to sterility the most efficient pastoral work performed in the principality during the Puritan era.

If Henry saw his dearest objects falling frustrate, Vavasor Powell and his more intimate followers witnessed the apparent negation of what were to them the most sacred sections of the Scriptures, the seventh chapter of Daniel and the twentieth of Revelation. As late as September 1659 he had signed a petition to Parliament expressing the belief that the penultimate troubles of the Republic marked the prelude to the coming of Christ as the Fifth Monarch[3] ; indeed, Morgan Llwyd had also sung some years before that ' [16]60 ' would see the dawn of the great Sabbath of the world and the arrival of the Great King from the east[4] ; even in April 1660 a Vavasorian schoolmaster of Llanfair in Montgomery named Rice Jones was sure in the belief that the Lord would do great things in righteousness that very month.[5] The 29th of the month of May saw coming to London, not the expected Fifth Monarch, but a very merry and material Fourth boasting the name of Charles Stuart, a Fourth Monarch of that last or ' Roman ' cycle said by millenarians to be represented by the fourth beast of Daniel. Very curiously, Charles was Roman in more senses than one, as the Secret Treaty of Dover, the Declaration of 1672, and the scene at his deathbed were to prove pretty conclusively. It is pathetic to note that to calculating chiliasts like John Canne and John Rogers 1660

1 *An Account of the Life and Death of Mr. Philip Henry* (1698), pp. 59-61.
2 *Hist. Eng. Church*, ii, App. IIIC, p. 456.
3 Miss Louise F. Brown : *Bapt. and Fifth Mon. Men*, pp. 189-190 (and footnotes)
4 *Gweithiau*, i, pp. 60, 87.
5 *C.S.P.*, 1659-1660, p. 407 (unless it is a forged letter).

was the year when not only the 'little horn' of Daniel vii would be finally destroyed, but would witness also the extension of the Fifth Monarchy to Babylonian Rome itself.[1]

Such an ambitious programme called for complete unanimity in the Puritan ranks and for very dry powder in the military horns. But dry powder meant endless Militia Acts and army assessments. Lack of unanimity led to the bewildering vicissitudes of 1659-1660. 'Sober men were in an Egypt and long'd for their Exodus.'[2] Taking full advantage of these inchoate desires of the average man, the restoration of the Fourth Monarchy was excellently stage-managed by Monck. The sober men proved too powerful for the Vavasorian dreamers. Where were now the 20,000 who were ready to march a few years back, and that against even a Puritan Protector? We are left with a forged letter about Desborough's activities at Llanwddyn,[3] and the evidence of a hostile sheriff of Montgomery that arms and long knives, prepared to support Lambert's insurrection of April 1660, had been concealed by the disaffected fanatics of that county to cut the throats of the Cavaliers of Cydewain and Kerry.[4] No one marched in Wales, and no throats were cut. Soon Gilbert Sheldon in a sermon before the King as Dean of the Chapel Royal was giving praise to God for 'the raising up of a Deliverer, never to be mentioned without Honour nor to be forgotten in the Prayers of all good People.'[5] Monck had managed to disarm that tenth man who terrorised the other nine.[6] The majority was once more in power.

(ii) 1660-1662.

With its genuine Puritans surrounded by a growingly hostile countryside, disastrously divided in matters of polity, distracted by the voices of rival doctrinaires, with adventurous Quakers roaming on horseback to break Baptist churches 'in peeses' and dub good Independents as no better than carnal 'priests,' Wales was sadly ill-equipped to meet the shock of the Restoration. Demoralising forces, silently gathering strength under the shadow of the Cromwellian

1 L. F. Brown: *Bapt. and Fifth Mon. Men*, p. 23.
2 Calamy: *Account* (1713), ii, 776 (a remark attributed to Edward Bowles of York).
3 *Extracts from St. Paps. relating to Friends*, ed. Penney, p. 116; Dr. John Stoughton: *Church of the Restn.*, ii, App. I, 509-512.
4 *C.S.P.*, 1660-1661, p. 130 (Sir Matthew Price to Secy. Nicholas, 24 July, 1660).
5 Vernon Staley: *Life of Sheldon*, p. 233 (sermon delivered on 28 June).
6 For the exact force of this remark, see Calamy: *Continuation* (1727), i, 8.

toleration, fermented *within* the Puritan ranks. The proscription lists had never been completed: it is known that in South Wales alone 127 of the old Anglican clergy remained unmolested as late as 1652,[1] and that comparatively few were ejected between that date and 1660; more significant still, not a few of those *ejected* between 1645 and 1653 managed to find favour with the Triers and worm their way back to their old parishes (even Alexander Griffith was Puritan schoolmaster at the Hay in the closing years of the interregnum[2]).

More ominous yet, some prominent Parliamentary officers had some time ago began to subject their old enthusiasm to new valuations. At one period Sir Thomas Myddelton of Chirk was Captain-General of the forces in North Wales; but frightened by the execution of the King, he got so lukewarm as to correspond with Prince Charles[3] and to take an active part in the Cheshire rising of Sir George Booth, besides ordering his steward to give secret doles of money to the family of 'Ficer y Waen,' and further sums to provide for the pains and 'dyett' of a Ruabon curate who came down to minister to the parishioners of Chirk.[4] Is it surprising that on 14 April, 1660, the King held out to him an offer of pardon for all past offences?[5] With agile gymnastic—to come to an attitude of mightier moment—men hitherto unexceptionable in their loyalty to the 'good old cause' began to accommodate their backs to the new situation. When one reads that he had been a Commissioner for the Propagation, a member of the most important Protectorate committees, made a member of Oliver's 'other house' in 1657 and responsible for the great Protector's funeral arrangements in 1658, there is no need to labour further the fact that Philip Jones of Llangyfelach had grown into a very powerful political personality; yet, notwithstanding the virulent attacks made upon him by Anglican clergy and disillusioned Dissenters, he weathered the storms of the Restoration, secured his new estates pretty well intact, and before his death had become High Sheriff of Glamorgan.[6] Young

1 *MS. J. Walker*, c. 7, f. 215b.
2 *Lambeth Aug. Bk.* 987, f. 322 [Entry K. 37].
3 *C.S.P.*, 1651, pp. 200, 201, 204, and very especially p. 337.
4 *Chirk Castle Accts.* (compiled by W. M. Myddelton), pp. 81, 88, 94.
5 *C.S.P.*, 1660-1661, p. 5.
6 *H.P.M.*, p. 95.

Edmund Thomas of Wenvoe was also made one of Cromwell's peers, and though he is described by a lampoonist of 1659 as 'none of the high sectaries of Wales,'[1] yet is down with an Anglican of a later generation in the catalogue of men who had deeply dipped their hands into the revenues of the Cathedral church of Llandaff[2]: who but he in 1668 was one of those to issue an order to arrest Vavasor Powell after the Merthyr conventicle and bring him under escort to Cardiff gaol?[3] Conscientious scruples in the case of Myddelton, an instinct for self-preservation in the case of Jones, a reversal in the case of the Wenvoe squire to the teaching he had received in his younger days at the church house of Llantrithyd under Leoline Jenkins[4]—secured the allegiance of each one respectively to the restored King. And in north-western Wales, did not the truculent Yorkshireman, Colonel George Twisleton, settle down quietly as husband of the heiress of Lleuar, and did not the Bucks. nondescript John Carter carry away the heiress of Kinmel, 'the best piece of Holland in the county,' and forget his exploits in the service of the Parliament at the siege of Carnarvon Castle in 1646? Not, however, without the latter's son Thomas (in an Exchequer case of 1673) being very pertinently reminded of his father's antecedents.[5] If such was the story of prominent Parliamentarians in South and North, it would assuredly be copied by scores of smaller men. The folios of the *Bodleian MS.* A. 119, chronicling the offices and pensions granted by the King during the first seventeen months of the Restoration, contain the names of several Welshmen who had not long before been loud-voiced in their protestations of loyalty to the Commonwealth and Protectorate (especially the John Carter just referred to, made a knight, steward of the manor of Denbigh, and governor of the fort and garrison of Holyhead[6]).

To such men, expert though they were in catching the run of the wind, the year 1660 was a difficult time, beset with many pitfalls. To lukewarm Puritan ministers and to the Trier-

1 *A Second Narrative of the Late Parliament* . . . p. 17, lampoon No. 35 (Thomason Colln., B.M.).
2 *MS. J. Walker*, c. 4, f. 65—'alias my Lord Thomas.'
3 *Life* (1671), pp. 133-134.
4 John Aubrey: '*Brief Lives*' (ed. Andrew Clark), ii. 7.
5 *Exchequer Bills & Answers*, 35 Chas. II, Denbigh, No. 48 (evidence of Dame Margaret Williams).
6 pp. 11, 55.

tolerated Anglican element who had unobtrusively made the best of two dispensations, it came as a welcome reaction. Their plans were long ready. The first Welsh minister to seek confirmation of his right under the Great Seal to the *same* living he had received in 1655 from the Puritan Triers was Owen Eyton of Corwen.[1] He had been forestalled a few days before by Roger Jones, appointed to Llanerfyl by the Puritan Lords in 1647, and now promoted by the King to the living of Montgomery.[2] After these the deluge : no less than 35 altogether sought the sanction of the Great Seal during 1660 and 1661 ; six further names have found their way to the ' second admission ' bundles at the Public Record Office ; over 40 others, all appointed by one or other of the Parliamentary committees sitting between 1642 and 1660, reappear as Restoration conformists in collateral documents of equal authority with the foregoing—records of admission on the First Fruits' certificates presented to the remembrancer by the Bishops, later returns of the same Bishops to Archbishop Sheldon's interrogatories in 1665,[3] contemporary diaries, stray entries on the Patent Rolls, and incidental references in the *Tanner MSS.* at the Bodleian. Never was there such an indecent scramble for re-sanction, re-ordination, and re-admission. Two instances must suffice to show, amongst other things, the nimble doings of a time of transition. On 24 March, 1659-1660, John Williams was approved by the last board of Triers to the living of Devynnock, and on 3 July of the same year he was confirmed in his title by the King[4] ; in the early months of 1660 Jenkin Lloyd—a prehensile artist who had once done the duty concurrently of ' approving ' under the Propagation Act and of acting as Bursar of Jesus, developing afterwards into an M.P. in the Protectorate Parliaments—was a republican commissioner for assessments in Cardigan and Carmarthen, but on 25 June of that same year he is found sanctioned under the Great Seal in his old rectory of Llangoedmor.[5] These two disciples of Mammon did not quite fall into the same category : Williams

1 *Lamb. Aug. Bk.* 996, f. 314 ; *Pat. Rolls*, 12 Chas. II, part 1, No. 440.
2 *H.P.M.*, p. 65 ; *Pat. Rolls*, 12 Chas. II, pt. 1, No. 448.
3 *Lamb. MS.* 639, ff. 300-303b, 332-336, 336b-337 (names of former Puritan ministers interspersed).
4 *Certificates of Second Adms.*, pt. 1, No. 22 ; *Pat. Rolls*, Chas. II, pt. 1, No. 420.
5 Firth and Rait : *Acts and Ords.*, ii, 1382 ; *Pat. Rolls*, 12 Chas. II, pt. 1, No. 431.

was an old Anglican instituted to Llywel in April 1640,[1] while Lloyd had been reputed one of the most dependable characters in Puritan administration. Neither the records of Congregation at Oxford nor the plurality returns of the Bishop of St. David's in 1665 shows that Jenkin ever looked regretfully back over his shoulder to his busy days as a Puritan ; for he died an Anglican D.D. in possession of the rectory of Llannerchllwydog in addition to that of Llangoedmor, keeping a curate at the former place.[2] At this point some reference should be made to the piquantly diverse attitudes of the Fogg family. Robert the father refused to conform and lost the rich living of Bangor Monachorum ; his two sons, Laurence and Roland, followed the line of least resistance, thus keeping their clerical interests at Hawarden and Overton respectively. Some time in 1660, it is said, a man brought his child to the father to be baptised, asking him to make the sign of the Cross. Robert Fogg's answer was : " I will not cross it ; but if you will go to my son Roland, he will cross it, and cross thee, and cross me too."[3] The defection of prominent Puritan leaders was made more serious by the passing away in death of Morgan Llwyd and Walter Cradock, both in 1659. Richard Powell, the aggressive vicar of Glasbury who was reported in 1654 to be scouring his pistols for an adventure against the Protector,[4] had preceded them in 1658.

Even before the first feckless conformist had applied for the sanction of the Great Seal, the imposing Puritan edifice came tumbling down : the last panel of Triers passed into oblivion ; the Trustees held their last meeting on 11 May, 1660[5] ; their resignation involved in ruin all the Puritan free schools and a stoppage of salary (or augmentation at least) to all ministers in England and Wales who drew their maintenance from the funded revenues of the bishops and chapters ; the Puritan army, the servant and master of the defunct Republic which had startled the world by its doings from Marston to the Dunes, was to be disbanded as soon as possible. All this boded very ill to Baptists and Independents and all

1 *Lib. Inst.*, St. David's, f. 47.
2 *Tanner MS.* 338, f. 103 ; *Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 333.
3 Calamy : *Continuation*, ii, 836.
4 *Thurloe St. Papers*, ii, 93.
5 *Lambeth Aug. Bk.* 989, f. 196.

men of advanced opinion, especially since the newly-elected Convention Parliament was not unequally divided between Presbyterians who had called the King back and Cavaliers who had spent 18 years waiting for a day of reckoning. At first, the air was full of compromise and ecclesiastical comprehension, so much so that the Bapto-Independent John Davies, an old soldiering tailor who had fought at Worcester and was now holding the living of Llangattock in Brecon, decided to hie to Hereford to receive Presbyterian orders at the hands of an improvised 'classis' which existed in that city.[1] In reality, the more intimate advisers of the King were marking time as a matter of tactics. Gilbert Sheldon preached before Charles at Whitehall a sermon (long enough for any Presbyterian!) from Psalm xviii, 49, containing a passage towards the end full of sane good-will, disdaining to retain the memory of former unkindnesses[2]; and Bishop George Morley (with Chancellor Clarendon by his side) pleasantly told Baxter at the Worcester House conference that no man had written better common sense about liturgies and ceremonies than himself (Baxter). 'Though,' the great comprehensionist goes on sadly to say, 'they shortly after silenced me without any change in me alledged.'[3]

The change did not lie in Baxter, but in the political situation. As the summer of that eventful year wore on towards autumn the Oblivion Act was passed (end of August), and the chief regicides suffered the extreme penalty; the army was in the main disbanded (on a journey to London in October Philip Henry met many of the soldiers 'going homewards two or three in a company'[4]); and by the end of November it was known that the Convention had refused effective support to the King's Declaration of October which bade fair to presbyterianise the Church of England. About the beginning of the following January the failure of Venner's Fifth Monarchy insurrection had definitely convinced the extremest Republican that an earthly King had come to stay;

1 *Exchequer Depositions*, Mixed Cos. (Brecon & Radnor), No. 8, Hilary, 15-16, Chas. II (evidence of Thomas Williams, Morgan Williams, and William Edwards, all from the parish of Llangattock).

2 Vernon Staley: *Life of Sheldon*, App. iv, esp. pp. 261-262 (the whole sermon takes up pp. 217-264).

3 *Baxter Letters*, ii. 129. This is written in Baxter's own hand at the foot of a letter written him by John Lewis of Glasgrug in May 1656.

4 *Diaries*, pp 71-72 (letter to his young wife from London, 9 Oct., 1660).

before the end of June it was painfully evident that all hope of accommodation between Anglicans and Presbyterians was over and done with. The bright hopes of Worcester House were quenched at the Savoy. Had not the Cavalier Parliament been elected, and was not the coming Act of Uniformity stridently heralded in the early speeches of the new assembly ? Let it not be forgotten that all the M.P.'s sent up from Wales were Anglicans without qualification.

In theory that historic Act was not placed on the statute book before May 1662, in hard practice it was written in very live letters long before that time. From the day of the King's return Cavalier soldiers scoured the country ; from the same day Anglican jurists dated the restoration of the Church of England in its full power and prestige, accompanied in its resurrection by the whole apparatus of penal laws passed in the reigns of Elizabeth and James. The submerged majority on the countryside rose with the fierce fervour of a delayed enthusiasm ; the picturesque customs of Anglican worship, now long disused in public, were everywhere observed with an emphasised devotion. Puritan preachers became marks of suspicion and of scorn. Persecution developed into a robust science as well as a fine art. On the score of his being a dangerous fanatic Vavasor Powell had been brought to prison at Welshpool even before the arrival of the King (the possible illegality of which action was indemnified by the Militia Acts of 1661 and 1663) ; he was to be alternately released and re-secured till his abiding incarceration at Welshpool at the end of July 1660[1] ; from then till his death ten years later he was to inhabit continuously the King's prisons except for a month's interval in 1661 and ten months' liberty in 1667-1668. For preaching to a large congregation at Llanthetty in Brecknock, his old friend Jenkin Jones was led to prison at Carmarthen, angry shouts and hard stones being hurled at him.[2] Thus the gathered churches of the Severn hinterland and the 'free' Baptists of the Black Mountain slopes were left without leaders. The powerful Independent community of Monmouth, grown to strength under the tutelage of Wroth and Cradock, were startled to hear that the latter's spiritual legatee, the staid

1 *C.S.P.*, 1660-1661, pp. 123, 130, 135-136, 176.
2 *Lord's Loud Call to England*, pp. 13-14 (Thomason Colln., E. 1038.8).

and orthodox Henry Walter of Newport, had suffered 'rude proceeds' from a drunken company of soldiers at Llantarnam[1]; and the close corporate life so sedulously fostered by John Miles at Ilston suffered disruption, as testified by the sudden break in the record of baptisms there after August 12, and the passing into law by the Convention of an Act which made it impossible for him to minister officially in that parish after September 13. A more conservative Puritan than Miles, the presbyterially-ordained pastor of Llangynwyd —a sometime Fellow and Bursar of Jesus, son-in-law of a former High Sheriff of the county—found the atmosphere of Tir Iarll in 1661 full of the 'rejoicing hearts of many profane ones'[2]; while Edmund Hall, an old student of Christ Church, a Puritan minister ejected from Llansantffraid ym Mechain by the intrusion of an Anglican cleric against the spirit of that Act that legally ousted Miles from Ilston, a minister too who had kept altogether immune from the dangerous influence of Vavasor Powell in that cantrev—saw himself driven out from a messuage held by him by an assembly of men armed with a liberal supply of swords and cudgels and guns (with bows and arrows in reserve).[3] In rout and riot the clamorous majority were in no mood to discriminate between the Puritan schools. The right suffered with the left.

Further to the north a *Mostyn MS.* has brought to light what a loyal servant to the new state William Griffith of Cefn Amwlch could be. As High Sheriff of Caernarvon he was soon in full cry after three distinct types of delinquency: hasty words by Edmund Glynne of Hendre about the vicar of Llanbeblig's 'connering' from the Prayer Book; obscure references to great men in London (Monck being one) by countrymen still more obscure living in distant Llangwnadl; the possible concealment of weapons by Jeffrey Parry of Rhydolion and Thomas Madryn of Madryn.[4] A letter concerning a debt sent by an exile from Lleyn to his brother was intercepted by the authorities, and the bearer committed to custody at Caernarvon.[5] Former Puritan soldiers being

1 *Lord's Loud Call to England*, p. 26 (letter written from Newport, 12 July, 1660).
2 Frank Bate: *Decl. of Indulgence*, p. 15 (n. 69)—letter of Samuel Jones to Baxter, 29 April, 1661.
3 *Controlment Roll* 310, m. 66, Trinity, 13 Chas. II; also 312, m. 79, 14 Chas. II.
4 *N.L.W. MS.* 3071*E* (formerly Mostyn MS. 237), ff. 1-30, 45-79 (passim).
5 *ib.*, ff. 117, 149 There is a chronological fallacy in the arrangement of this MS, since f. 117 bears the date 16 Jan., 1661-*1662*, and f. 149 the date 27 Dec., *1661*.

particularly suspect, they were also put under arrest, more especially a group hailing from Llanllyfni and Clynnog[1]; and two officers named Spicer and Jenkinson proved very successful in unearthing carbines and cases of pistols which were too dangerous to leave in the hands of republican sympathisers in the peninsula of Lleyn. An intercepted note from a Clynnog soldier, an Owen Morris who had seen service in Ireland, shows him desirous of knowing what liberty was like to be allowed in relation to the 'Service book.'[2] Philip Henry could have told Morris that the Book of Common Prayer was proffered him to read at Worthenbury chapel no less than four times between April 1661 and the end of August,[3] the last date being twelve months *before* clauses iii and iv of the Act of Uniformity made 'assent and consent' necessary to every minister in the land. If Morris was bent on attending religious meetings outside the walls of his parish church of St. Beuno, he would soon find that the Earl of Carbery as the King's Lord Lieutenant in Wales had branded such 'conventicles' as illegal nearly three years *before* the official Conventicle Act first came into force.[4] Very 'direct and carefull' were the Deputy Lieutenants to deal with these disaffected persons.

Thus busy were the new officials kept in discouraging Puritan preachers, in disarming Puritan soldiers, and in lengthening the shadows of the coming Penal Code. In 1660 and 1661 the new parliaments were equally busy in reviewing the depredatory energies of the 'usurped powers' and recovering for the Church and its children what was possible of their forfeited revenues. The Act of Oblivion was also an Act of Indemnity; otherwise, as Sheldon had pronounced in his sermon at the Chapel Royal, the restored Anglicans would with great ingratitude cast the blessings of Heaven back into the hands of Him that gave them and change one war into another.[5] Clause xv of that Act (as a restored rector of Portskewet was very prompt to remind a certain defendant living in that parish) excepted all church revenues

1 *N.L.W. MS.* 3071 *E.*, f. 59.
2 *ib.*, *ib.*
3 *Diaries*, pp. 83, 84, 89, 93.
4 *N.L.W. MS.* 3071 *E*, f. 138. Letter of Carbery to the D.L.'s of Caernarvon, dated 22 Oct., 1661.
5 Vernon Staley: *Life*, pp. 261-262 (the paragraph is not altogether free from obscurity)

in *Wales* since 1648 from the retrospective sanction assured to judgments of discharge given upon public exchequer accounts during the interregnum, with the result that there was issued to Robert Evans of Lleyn on the very next day after the passing of the Act a peremptory order to pay up the £100 ' now in his hands.'[1] A later order asked him and the ' cneifiwr glas ' of Edeyrnion (Edward Davies of Eglwyseg) to account between them for £300 due to the Treasury as officials under the Propagation Commissioners from 1650 to 1653.[2] Such orders from Whitehall were supplemented by roving commissioners of enquiry sent to all parishes in the country which had been subject to sequestration during the ' late times ' : as early as 29 October, 1660, such a commission visited Caldicot in Monmouth and demanded the delivering up of bonds for payment of £8 tithe-rents from Nicholas Hollister, one of the Puritan ' farmers ' of the living, who had failed to collect it when it became due.[3] And it was open to the restored clergyman to demand at the Court of Exchequer itself repayment of all the tithes and revenues accruing to him since the day he was dispossessed by the agents of the Parliamentary committees or commissions, upon which the Court appointed, under the name of commissioners ' sitting in the country,' a group of respectable county gentlemen to ascertain the true facts of the case. The Bassaleg case introduces us both to a new kind of Anglican and to another aspect of that Court's jurisdiction. George Watkin, rector of that living since 1624 and left there *undisturbed* throughout all the Puritan epoch, on account of having indiscreetly allowed himself to become a ' receiver ' of tithes (apart from merely ' enjoying ' them) for the hamlet of Grange in that parish, was the object of unwelcome attention on the part of Attorney-General Palmer at the Court of Exchequer in the Hilary Term of 1661-1662, a situation made more poignant by his being bracketed in the plaint with a horde of Puritan lay officials who had laid sacrilegious hands on the tithes and profits of the Bishop and Chapter of Llandaff. The benediction of the ' usurped powers ' was now to load

1 *C.S.P.*, 1660-1661, p. 206. 30 August. Robert Evans was also one of those who had to hand over cases of pistols, three in his case, to the Militia authorities in 1661 (*N.L.W. MS.* 3071 *E*, f. 70).

2 *C.S.P.*, 1660-1661, p. 260. 7 September.

3 *Exchequer Bills & Answers*, Mon., No 2, Mich., 13 Chas. II (answers of Nicholas Hollister of Caldicot and George Edwards of Llanwern).

him with a debt of £20 a year for every year he had acted as 'receiver.'[1]

Other clauses in the Act of Indemnity demand some consideration before we proceed to notice other enactments which followed close in its wake. The once powerful Trustees were not likely to be forgotten by the lawyers of the Convention. By clause xlv they had to account punctiliously for all revenues and rents within their jurisdiction under the Act of 1649[2] which were left undisbursed by them or by their orders, a clause which would make them inquire very closely what had happened to the £30 Flintshire tithes received by one of their agents (and that as late as June 1660) at the inn of William Foreman in Ruthin, with two ministers as witnesses of the payment.[3] It is well to point out that by subsection 5 of that same clause all salaries *already* paid by them to ministers and schoolmasters were to pass into oblivion as a strange species of *res gestae*. But, and here we move away from the responsibilities of the Trustees, indemnity had to be done by those who had entered upon the 'fabrick' lands of any church (Cathedral or otherwise) and had sacrilegiously enriched themselves by converting to their own use and advantage plate, utensils, or other materials belonging to any such churches: it was not long before two former Propagation Commissioners, William Barber and Rowland Dawkins of Cilffriw, had to hand over £69 'de quibusdam feloniis et sacrilegiis' committed in the church of Tenby,[4] and before a yeoman of Portskewet named William Mathew was asked to make retribution for the timber he had cut down and carried away from the glebelands of that parish.[5] Such indemnities, representing the agreed policy of the Presbyterians and Cavaliers who composed the Convention, were not deemed sufficiently satisfactory by the full-blooded Churchmen of the Cavalier Parliament which met in 1661. An Act 'explanatory' of the Act of Oblivion was passed[6]; new commissions of discovery were issued; another Act—'for the more speedy and effectual bringing those persons

1 *Exchequer Bills & Answers*, Mon., No. 14, Hilary, 13-14 Chas. II.
2 That is, the Act of June 1649 which created the "trust" and appointed the Trustees (Firth and Rait: *Acts and Ordinances*, ii, 147 et seq.).
3 *Exchequer Depositions*, Flint, No. 12, Easter, 17 Chas. II (depositions made at the house of William Parry at Diserth, 17 April, 1665).
4 *Controlment Roll* 313, m. 3 (dorse), Hilary, 14-15 Chas. II.
5 *Exch. Bills & Ans.*, Mon., No. 9, Trinity, 14 Chas. II.
6 13 Chas. II, cap. 3.

into account ' whose doings were excepted from the Act of Indemnity—was rushed through the two Houses in 1662[1]: these new enactments are reflected in the writs sent out to the ' petty constables ' of Wales (some of whose returns are embodied in the *Lambeth MS.* 1027), in the ' declared accounts ' of the Audit Office (so called because they had to be produced and passed before the Barons of the Exchequer), and in still further local commissions of inquiry issuing from the same Barons (similar to that which sat at the house of Evan Thomas of Tretower to unravel the tangled story of the Llangattock transactions[2]). To round off the purport of this paragraph, it might be the opinion of the doughty old Cavalier Judge David Jenkins of Hensol, disappointed of a judgeship at Westminster Hall, that there was more oblivion than indemnity[3]; such opinion would not be shared by the four fishermen of Llanfihangel Roggiett who were asked to pay £200, being tithes of ' sea-fish ' caught by them from 1648 to 1660, and now demanded by Henry Walker, the rector dispossessed during those twelve years[4]; nor by William Blethin of Dinham, Puritan descendant of a former Bishop of Llandaff, who himself at Undy had farmed the sequestered premises of a later Bishop of that see,[5] and who in 1661 was made one of the defendants in the Caldicot case for his work as Parliamentary agent to Puritan commissioners. A day of reckoning had surely come to the disciples of Llanfaches.

Mysterious references have been made to ' restored ' Anglicans and to the legal expulsion of John Miles from Ilston. All these owe their origin not to the two-handed engine of Oblivion forged in August 1660, but to the double-barrelled Act of September which became law just about a fortnight afterwards. For this Act was meant to confirm some ministers in the livings which they held and (with greater emphasis) to restore others to the livings which they had lost. By the combined force of clauses i and xi (the Act is quoted as 12 Chas. II, cap. 17[6]) all ministers by whomsoever ordained

1 13 & 14 Chas. II, cap. 16.
2 *Exchequer Depositions*, Mixed Cos. (Brecknock & Radnor), No. 8, Hilary, 15-16 Chas. II.
3 Anthony Wood: *Athenae Oxon.* (1692), ii, 221.
4 *Exchequer Bills & Ans.*, Mon., No. 8, Trinity, 14 Chas. II; No. 41, Mich.; No. 6, Mich., 15 Chas. II.
5 *MS. J. Walker*, c. 13, f. 43; see also *Lamb. MS.* 913, f. 767.
6 For a full copy of this Act, see *Statutes at Large* (1734), ii, 504-508.

were confirmed in the livings they held at that date, if they had not declared against infant baptism or had not done anything to compass or defend the death of Charles I; by the joint effect of clauses iv and xi all ejected clergymen were to be restored to their old livings before 25 December, 1660, if they had observed a similar degree of inertia; by clause xx all had to swear the oaths of allegiance and supremacy. It follows that the claims of the restored Anglicans had first to be satisfied before the authorities could possibly know who were the Puritans entitled to confirmation of title. If any minister who had a claim to this confirmation had not been punctilious in paying the 'fifths' of the sequestration ordinances to the family of the sequestered clergyman (be that clergyman now living or dead), he had by a collation of clauses vii, viii and ix to pay all arrears up to Michaelmas 1659. Though the records of such retrospective payments are exceedingly sparse (Walker mentions a case from Chetton in Salop where £80 of such arrears had to be paid[1]), there is no room to doubt that if, for example, Richard Evans of Llanasa could prove no allowance of 'fifths' for fourteen years from his intruded successor William Smith, the latter had a large sum to pay in 1660, the vicarage being worth from £80 to £100 per annum.[2] Nor is it likely that the conformity of Smith, appointed first to Whitford and then to Wrexham,[3] would have any bearing on the strict legal issue. To compensate somewhat for these injunctions over 'fifths,' all ministers confirmed or removed could by clause x demand all arrears of tithes up to Michaelmas 1660; and it is to be hoped that Playfair Field, who could not prove any ecclesiastical connection with Raglan, was not successful in claiming the agistment of lands and tithes in that parish, since the defendants in the suit could say that he only *happened* to have a sister living there and only *happened*, when coming there casually to visit her, to read the Prayer Book three or four Sabbath days in the parish church.[4]

Of great importance also was clause xxi which laid it down

1 *Sufferings*, ii, 14 (col. 2).
2 *Lamb. MS.* 1027 (Llanasa report). The deposition before the 'petty constables' was made by Evans on 11 June, 1662.
3 *First Fruits Certificates*, St. Asaph, File 14.
4 *Exchey. Bills & Ans.*, Mon., No. 20, Hilary, 16-17 Chas. II.

that all persons presented by the King to livings under the Great Seal—a right which under the advice of over-fervent Anglicans in his entourage he had used in the most arbitrary fashion not only for the benefit of Puritan conformists but to the disadvantage of Puritan nonconformists—between 1 May and 9 September were not to be touched. Not even by the claims of those who had a clear right to be confirmed under clause i. Indeed, very soon after the Act was passed the Presbyterians of the capital were asking the King not to use the Great Seal to put clerics into 'dead places' or 'mort livings,' that is, livings where the sequestered incumbent was dead.[1] No heed was paid to their petition. No less than 25 Puritan ministers in Wales, mostly appointed by the Triers, found themselves outlawed from their livings under the operation of clause xxi alone. Under clause iv nearly 40 other Puritan ministers had to give way to the old guard, even if that meant the restoration to Glasbury of the profligate pamphleteer Alexander Griffith and to Castell Caereinion of the drunken reprobate Rice Wynne.[2] Seven Baptists, with John Miles at their head, Baptists who had succumbed to the attractions of State pay, were automatically displaced by clause xi (and that whether the old incumbent was alive or dead). It was under this Act of September that Philip Henry had to cede Worthenbury to Dr. Henry Bridgeman, a cession which that Presbyterian by his sober and saintly knowledge of the 32 clauses of the Act managed to delay till October 1661, more than a year after the Act was passed.[3] The fact that it was under this Act the cession took place takes the sting out of Henry's famous remark that he died the first time *on St. Bartholomew's Day in 1662*.[4] If this latter calamity be accepted as authentic, then he must have died in all no less than *three* times.

Leaving the point as one of the unconscious witticisms of a time of tragedy, it must be admitted that this Act of September, remembering the crying necessity for some compromise between Anglicans clamouring for their old livings and Puritans who were loth to deny the appointing authority

1 *Docts. Act Unif.*, ed. Gould, Doct. vi, 26-27. For the term 'mort livings,' see Calamy: *Continuation*, i, 158.
2 *Bodl. Addit. MS.* c. 304b, f. 31 (Dolben Papers).
3 *Diaries*, p. 98.
4 *ib.*, pp. 145, 389. The remark, of course, is a play upon the terms 'dead' and 'naturally dead' in the Act of Uniformity.

of the republican committees, was not unfair in its general purport, however unfortunate it might prove in its individual incidence. But the sad fact is that it never stood a chance of being worked fairly between the two interests. The growing arrogance of the dominant party, following upon the disappearance of the army, saw to that: bishops appointed clergymen to livings already in possession of a Puritan minister, although the former Anglican incumbent was dead; there are cases of Puritan conformists driving out ministers who could legally claim the livings under clause i; instances can be given of a clergyman properly restored under clause iv receiving in addition another living to the disadvantage of a sitting Puritan; in the case of Llangattock in Brecon, a somewhat irregular Puritan with a valid claim under the Act had to give way in order that the new Bishop of Llandaff might secure a comfortable sinecure.[1] Cavalier patrons did as they liked with their impropriate interests. And, of course, vague charges of 'fanaticism' could always be brought up against stalwart Dissenters; a refusal to read the Prayer Book was deemed a crime long before it was made compulsory to use it; the oaths of allegiance and supremacy proved very awkward stumbling-blocks to many straightforward souls. In any case, there were over 20 cases of reputed Puritans being ousted from their livings, not because of the Act, but in spite of it: the crowning infamy of the Restoration ejections. They lost their livings because the laws were silent.

How oppressive the atmosphere of indemnity created by the Act of Oblivion had become and how utterly the September compromise had failed to induce a feeling of stability, are well illustrated by the fears of a rector of Llanbedrog, an Evan Jones originally appointed to that living by the Triers in May 1658.[2] That Puritan opportunist hoped to train under the Triers and hunt with the Bishops. But he was almost frightened out of his life to find that he, assessed at only £95 a year under the Militia Act, had to supply a horse and arms for the State just as if he were the Lord Bishop

1 The Puritan John Davies was articled against in the consistory court of Brecon on *20 May*, 1661 (*Exch. Deps.*, Mixed Cos., No. 8, Hilary, 15-16 Chas. II). On *19 July*, 1661, Bishop Hugh Lloyd was admitted to the rectory (*First Fruits Certifs.*, St. Davids, File 13).

2 *Second Admission Certifs.*, Part ii, No. 47.

of the diocese (that prelate was expected to be responsible for one horse and no more); though he was ready and willing, as he says, to serve his Majesty with both hands and heart, he had also to asseverate in two separate appeals to the authorities that his tenure of the living lay 'at greate hazard and uncertaintye.' It was rather ominous that he felt deserted by neighbouring rectors (this he writes across the margin of his second letter). To a man who had accepted favours from the powers of the interregnum, clause i of the September Act was a poor shield against Sir John Owen of Clenennau and the restored Bishop of Bangor, even if that recipient was now aged, sickly, and having to provide for five motherless children.[1]

In the event the fears of Evan Jones proved groundless. He was fully re-admitted to Llanbedrog on 25 September, 1662, and lived to enjoy his new status till 1688.[2] The fortunate dissipation of this opportunist's uncertainties must not blunt the edge of the somewhat startling fact that close upon 100 ministers of Wales were ejected *before the advent of the Act of Uniformity, and only about* 30 *under that Act itself.* What happened to the total Puritan personnel minus the conformists and minus those ejected for any cause—what happened to this residue must be left as a field for further research. Enough has been said to prove that anniversaries and centenaries of 24 August, 1662, as far as Wales is concerned, are chronologically unsound; and enough also to show that the lists of ejected given in the *Account* of the nonconformist Calamy and those of non-subscribing Puritans in the diocese of St. David's sent by Bishop William Lucy to Lambeth in 1665 are both of them quite inadequate.[3] Even the latest edition of Calamy's work does not account for more than 87 beneficed ministers who suffered ejection between the coming of the King and the end of 1662. 87. not 130.

It would require many chapters to trace the perplexing cross-classifications of the years after the Restoration, to

1 For his case, see *N.L.W. MS. 3071 E*, ff. 76, 115 (appeal of 13 Jan., 1661-1662), 141 (appeal of 28 Oct., 1661). According to f. 76, Jones had to supply ⅓ of a horse, while another rector was assessed for the remaining ⅔.

2 *Hanes Eglwysi a Phlwyfi Lleyn* (ed D. T. Davies, 1910), pp. 66, 70-71.

3 For England the same conclusion has been arrived at by Alexander Gordon in his article on *Calamy as a Biographer* (*Trans. Cong. Hist. Soc.*, Aug. 1914, pp. 233-247, especially p. 239).

picture the by-play of diverse temperaments and varying convictions, to disentangle the stirrings of conscience from the tactics of expediency. Taking the Act of Uniformity as the standard of argument, Samuel Jones of Llangynwyd and others were lucky enough to serve in their parishes until Bartholomew's; there were at least six cases of men who had conformed before 1662 nonconforming in that year; four refused to submit in 1662, but did submit in later years; there was a curious class of 10 (at least) who had been ejected before the Act and who did ultimately conform, but not in 1662; and what is one to make of Henry Maurice of Lleyn who surrendered his curacy of Llannor about 1660, conformed as vicar of Bromfield by Ludlow[1] and afterwards as rector of Church Stretton,[2] finally breaking into nonconformity about 1671, to become one of the greatest lights of Puritan Wales from 1672 down to the day of his death?[3] And what of Thomas Freeman, who was sanctioned by the Great Seal in September 1660 to hold two Pembrokeshire livings, was ejected at St. Bartholomew's, conformed again before 1665, and was allowed to return to one of them?[4] Even this catalogue is not in any way exhaustive, since it does not allow for those who lost their livings in 1660-1661 and were in legal possession of *other* benefices *before* the Act of Uniformity came into operation, nor for the strange vicissitudes of Matthew Jenkins of Gresford (ejected therefrom by the Act of September, soon admitted to Shotwick by the Bishop of Chester, ejected from that living in 1662, conformed again by acceding to the incumbency of Stoak-in-Wirral[5]). And who would think that an illiterate Anabaptist of Abergavenny would find his way into the national fold in 1664? This bizarre development is first vouched for in the pages of Baxter, but it receives indirect confirmation in the Llandaff episcopal certificates and in a very curiously worded letter of protest found among the *Dolben Papers*.[6]

Even a 'calculating' divine like Dr. Richard Price, to quote the term applied to him by his great contemporary Burke, might make a mistake in drawing up the religious

1 *First Fruits Certifs.*, Hereford, File 11 (admitted there 20 March, 1660-1661).
2 *ib.*, *ib.*, File 12 (admitted 3 June, 1668).
3 Calamy: *Account* (1713), ii, 567-572.
4 Cp. *Pat. Rolls*, 12 Chas. II, pt. 1, No. 136, with *Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 336b.
5 Calamy: *Acct.* (1713), ii, 716; *Noncon. Mem.*, i, 346; Henry: *Diaries*, p. 225.
6 *Bodl. Addit. MS.* c. 302, f. 121 (anonymous, to Archbishop Sheldon).

statistics of the Restoration era. As a philosopher it would fall to his lot to analyse refractory cases of conscience and to distinguish the 'little nicks' from the 'great gashes.'[1]

NOTE: GWYDIR EVIDENCE.

It would be unlikely, with all the wealth of interest contained in the *Calendar of Wynn Papers* published in 1926, there should not be some evidence of the impact of the Restoration upon the attitude of Puritan ministers. Almost of necessity this evidence is primarily confined to Puritans who conformed.

Richard Edwards, Puritan vicar of Llanfair in Dyffryn Clwyd, was once Puritan enough to be made 'approver' under the Propagation Act at a salary of a hundred per annum. William Brickdall (or Brigdale) was in 1648 appointed rector of Llanrwst, and that by the Presbyterian powers during their short heyday of authority in Southern Britain. Naturally he had to take the Covenant. Edwards was in 1665 given the rich living of Oswestry by the presentation of Lord Craven; two years later he was sending his son to ultra-Anglican Oxford and trying to get him a scholarship there by proving his family to be distant relatives of the Wynns of Gwydir (*Cal.*, doct. 2504). Brickdall at Llanrwst became a great confidant of the Wynns—"I am a constant resident at Gwydir"—and within about two months of his episcopal collation to the living he refers to his late Puritan benefactors as "devils incarnate" and compares the burning of the Covenant to the conflagration of the conjuring-books at Ephesus (*Cal.*, doct. 2300). He died vicar of Llanrwst, also of Llanbedr and Caerhun, chaplain to the Gwydir Hospital, Canon of St. Asaph, Precentor of Bangor. These two clerics were bent on making the best of both worlds.

Humphrey Prichard, another Puritan conformist, was not nearly so lucky. Indeed, he managed to burn his fingers rather badly. We first hear of him in 1651[2] as having been appointed minister of Gyffin by the Puritan commissioners for the Propagation. Maintenance, £50 per annum. In 1654 he received the approbation of the Puritan Triers, and had his salary raised from £50 to £70 (*Lambeth Augn. Books* 972, f. 370; 973, ff. 135, 428). By the Act of September, 1660, the rectory of Gyffin and all its profits reverted to their rightful Anglican possessor, who happened to be Dr. Griffith Williams, Bishop of Ossory and Dean of Bangor. It seems that he at first was willing to leave Prichard stay on as his vicar, but at a salary of £30 per annum (and not the £70 paid him in Puritan days). According to Prichard's story, the learned Doctor changed his mind, put into Gyffin a silly illiterate priest ordained by him in Ireland, who had agreed to serve the cure at a cheaper rate. Very naturally Prichard was in high dudgeon, and adjured Sir Richard Wynn to give his support to two pretty desperate courses—to help annex the rectory of Gyffin by Act of Parliament to the poor vicarage of Conway (then destitute of a minister), and to help deprive the Irish bishop of his deanery of Bangor (*Cal.*, doct. 2301). There were many sound reasons for both the measures suggested, but as coming from such a newly-found Anglican, the suggestions were not a little presumptuous. Gyffin was not annexed to Conway and Dr. Griffith Williams did not lose his deanery. But Prichard *was*

1 'Many a man nowadays makes a gash in his conscience, cannot you make a little nick in yours," said one of his parishioners to Nathaniel Heywood at Ormskirk (Bate: *Decl. of Indulgence*, p. 30).

2 He seems to have spent some time in the county of Rutland (*Conway Par. Regs.*, ed. Hadley, p. 140).

made vicar of Conway in 1662-3. There he remained till 1670, when for some obscure reasons he ran away from his cure. He disappears from the Wynn Papers with the aged Bishop Robert Morgan in keen pursuit—'to convene and convict him' for non-residence (*Cal.*, doct. 2586).

To the present writer Hugh Robinson, parson of Trefriw and Llanrhychwyn, always seemed nothing but a prosy materialist of no consequence to the countryside. The Wynn Papers have suddenly proclaimed him a man of weight, having enough address and mother wit to beard Archbishop John Williams in his retirement at Gloddaeth, to remind him of the approach of death, to remind him more especially of certain promises regarding land and property which he had made years ago to Owen Wynn of Gwydir (Wynn was married to the Archbishop's niece). All this in behalf of the aforesaid Wynn.[1] There were two such interviews, both of which were managed by the parson with great dexterity. And it must be admitted that it demanded no little courage in a country clergyman to waylay the mind of an ex-Archbishop who in the days of his prime was a match for the craftiest in the land. It is more relevant here to state that Hugh Robinson had none of the Puritan about him, and had in 1650 been ejected first from one group of livings and a fortnight later from the rest. Nor did the Restoration restore him to all he had lost. Such a stout and loyal Anglican must have viewed with rare disgust the agile gymnastic of his pseudo-Puritan neighbours. He died early in 1664. Though an effort was made by the Wynns to secure the succession at Trefriw and Llanrhychwyn to their factotum Brickdall (*Cal.*, doct. 2390), it is well to know that the honest old Anglican was not followed by such an ungrateful and unprincipled renegade.

1 The naive instructions given to Robinson by Wynn—the close attention he was to pay to the Archbishop's fateful answers, the going out for a pipe of tobacco in order to have an excuse for writing down very precisely the answers given inside, the care taken to conceal Wynn's own hand, the lone meeting of parson and squire on Llanrwst bridge a fortnight later—these are about the most piquant entries in the whole *Calendar* (Docts. 1831, 2869, 2870). The second and third of these papers are not in the Gwydir Collection, but in the *Cwrtmawr MS.* 36.

II.

THE PENAL CODE.

(i) Engines of Uniformity

It is not necessary for our purpose to deal exhaustively with the 32 clauses of the Act of Uniformity except to say that by attempting to force upon the country an impossible policy of comprehension its framers set a seal upon a religious schism which bids fair to last far beyond our own day, that they denounced the Covenant only to substitute for it the shibboleth of two declarations, and that by the legal fiction of the 'dead' clauses mortal men seemed to arrogate to themselves the dispensations of God. It is well to emphasise that the words 'dead' or 'naturally dead' occurred in the Act no less than five times,[1] a new mortmain created to prevent the outgoing Puritan minister from gathering in the great tithes of the year. A pin-pricking persecution of two years was now to be transformed into a pious vendetta regulated by consistory courts and quarter sessions.

The days of transition were over: in the treacherous twilight when Presbyterian divines were battling with bishops over the rights of entry into the National Church, Sheldon is reputed to have said that a man could go to heaven without using the Book of Common Prayer[2]; after Bartholomew he expressed his sorrow that so many Presbyterians had managed to utter the 'consent and assent.'[3] Besides the Archbishop's fears that the new Presbyterian conformists, like so many perjured Greeks, would one day bring the Anglican citadel to its doom, came the growing conviction of the Anglican lawyers that the 32 clauses of the Act of Uniformity were too few to parry the dangers arising from those nonconformists

1 Concluding words of clauses v, vi, x, xi, xiii (*Docts. Act Unif.*, ed. Gould, pp. 390-394).
2 *Noncon Mem.*, i, 428.
3 A. A. Seaton: *The Theory of Toleration*, p. 107.

who passed and re-passed in the gloom outside its walls. They had to be reinforced by powerful complements: the two Conventicle Acts, one laying a premium on imprisonment and the other on impoverishment, were to render ineffective the preaching of the minister and the support of the sheltering householder; the Five Mile Act was meant to segregate the minister from his congregation. By creating an unnatural nexus of allegiance to the State, they succeeded for a period in confusing loyalty to conscience with constructive treason. The *Oxford Oath* contained in clause ii of the Five Mile Act gave added emphasis to clause ix in the Act of Uniformity by forcing every nonconforming minister to swear that he would not 'endeavour any alteration of government, either in church or state'[1]; new life was given to the writ *de excomm. cap.;* unscrupulous informers, long in the ear and bottomless of pocket, roamed the country in search of conventiclers.[2] Nonconformists were persecuted by the Church and proscribed by the State. Persecuted men, for all that, have usually enormous reserves of moral resiliency. No great truths, and the Puritans were the custodians of many, are easily let die. Indeed, while the greatest glories of the interregnum must fall to the share of that stubborn band of Anglicans who believed in the historic continuity of their Church when both Papists and Presbyterians were anxiously awaiting the death of the last aged ex-Bishop, the invincible gallantry of the Puritan host, now shorn of its interested followers and of its atrophying materialism, is the great romance of the Restoration era.

(ii) The Strength of the Weak.

To cope with the elaborate corpus of repressive legislation, Puritans had perforce to develop into expert students of the law, as is testified by Philip Henry's five pertinent questions on the phraseology of the 'Act of Residense' (his synonym for the Five Mile Act),[3] and by Vavasor Powell's apt invocation of Coke's seventh book of Reports to prove that a man is bound to take the oath of allegiance but once in his lifetime.[4] About the last

1 *Docts. Act Unif.*, pp. 392, 489.
2 According to the terms of the second Conventicle Act, the 'informers' were to receive a proportion of the fines levied by the magistrates.
3 *Diaries*, p. 177.
4 *Life* (1671), pp. 185-186 (account of his third 'convention,' at the Cardiff Town Hall, on 13 Jan., 1668-1669).

glimpse we get of the Baptist David Davies (ejected from Neath under the Act of September) is his desire, expressed just two months after the Act of Uniformity became law, to get a second-hand copy of the *Statutes at Large* shewing what laws were repealed and which were not.[1] Some Puritan casuists made much of the omission of three important words in the Prayer Book declaration required by the Bartholomew Act[2]; Presbyterian divines forced the lawyers of the Crown to admit that 'endeavour' in the Oxford Oath meant '*unlawful* endeavour.'[3] Numberless ways were devised to evade the severities of the first Conventicle Act, one of the best being the alertness of the woman who guarded the upper room at Blaencanaid from unpleasant visitors (a safer expedient than the Matlock habit of 'sounding a trumpett' to call the conventiclers together).[4] As to the second Act of 1670, Philip Henry's description of the Whitchurch meeting and of the successful appeal made against conviction by the local magistrates on the ground that a daughter of the family, 'lately comm from Chester,' was not a visitor but an ordinary member of the family, and that the youth John Beard was not 16 years of age—all show how diligently clause i of that Act had been studied, although it had not been in force for more than twelve days when the conventicle was held.[5] But if Henry measured the distance from his new home at Broad Oak to the bounds of his old pastorate at Worthenbury and found it more than five *legal* miles, what remedy had he if the authorities went by *reputed* miles (which were only four), and thus forced him to move still further to Whitchurch?[6] On the other hand, if an ingenious Quaker like James Picton was haled to prison at Carmarthen, what remedy had Bishop Lucy when that gentleman harangued his friends from one of the windows?[7] The Bishop had to admit to his metropolitan that he did not know of any. Other expedients were ready to hand: the advantage taken of the peculiar disability *in Wales* of the writ *de excommunicato* in that it could

1 Joshua Thomas: *Hanes y Bedyddwyr* (Pontypridd edn.), p. 172, note *. David Davies to Walter Jones in London, dated 21 July, 1662, from Penmain in Gower.
2 A. A. Seaton: *The Theory of Toleration*, p. 336, n. 1.
3 Dr. John Stoughton: *Church of the Restn.*, i, 348-350.
4 Spinther James: *Hanes y Bedyddwyr*, ii, 468-469; for the Matlock conventicle, see *Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 191b.
5 *Diaries*, pp. 227-237.
6 *ib.*, pp. 181, 190, 194.
7 *Tanner MS.* 146, ff. 113, 138-138v.

not be procured direct from the sheriff, but had to be 'receiv'd and publisht' by the Judges of Assize[1]; strategic concentration on the borders of counties, especially in the Marches; the grouping of ejected ministers in towns not within the meaning of 'town corporate' in clause iii of the Five Mile Act

(iii) Faith and Figures.

Some were lucky possessors of a buoyant temperament, like that Border minister who, although (as he put it) he had shewn good arguments against nonconforming in the wants of a wife and ten children, had great faith in the fortifying doctrine of the fifth of Matthew, and often sang with his family Psalm xxxvii, 16, evidently adopting a line of exegesis that would not commend itself to Thorndike and Stillingfleet.[2] It was quite as well that 'the just man's mite' of that verse was reinforced by the gifts of friends; and it is pathetic to read of this Puritan optimist being robbed of household linen to the value of £6 or £7 on his arrival in London in the spring of 1671.[3] Not quite so substantial were the consolations derived by credulous minds (consolations not altogether refused by an M.A. of Christ Church like Philip Henry) from Ludlow hens whose colour were said to suffer change about August 1662,[4] and from the weird calculations of religious astrologers.[5] Calamities befalling men prominent in the persecutions and terrible visitations like the Plague and the Fire, were often assigned to the direct intervention of a Puritan Providence. The third Calamy, who was to act as the repository of these tragic tales, revels in such speculations, which find their most impossible illustration in the distemper termed *appetitus caninus* taking a woman whose main crime was to summon her husband, an officer of the law in Dorset, from church to disperse a meeting of dissenters.[6] Contemporary calculators concentrated on the day of St. Bartholomew's: not only did Philip Henry (incorrectly, as we have seen) declare he had died his first death on that date, but it so happened that he was born on 24 August, 1631; he took care to draw up his

1 *Tanner MS.* 146, ff. 30-30v.
2 *Diaries*, p. 209 [Edward Lawrence, ejected from Baschurch].
3 *ib.*, p. 238.
4 *ib.*, p. 155.
5 *ib.*, pp. 183-184 (more especially).
6 *Account* (1713), ii, 273.

will in 1695 on the same fatal feast.[1] Twelve years before that nonconformists were not slow to point out that Dr. John Owen died 21 years to the day after 'black Bartholomew.'[2] Before long Dr. John Walker retorted somewhat effectively in his *Sufferings* that 17 years before 1662, on the eve of St. Bartholomew's, a Presbyterian parliament had passed an ordinance to discontinue the use of the Common Prayer Book, both in private and in public, on pain of severe penalties.[3] His point was the natural one that, if providential retribution was to be erected into a doctrine, some of it would assuredly fall on the anniversaries of Presbyterian acts of oppression. And was it not reported to him that an intruding Puritan minister in Suffolk was struck dumb after reading out a text in the pulpit of his Anglican predecessor ?[4]

(iv) The Anglican Inquisition.

Nothing was to be gained by the childish manipulation of figures. Still it is appropriate to observe that no such consolations, be they superstitions or be they Scriptural, were needed to a world at peace. The play upon imperfections of writs and the uncanny knowledge of preachers turned jurists were necessary evils imposed upon men *in extremis*. Appeals could not lie without previous convictions. From 1664 to 1667 the pursuit was fierce. The ecclesiastical courts vied with the secular in pushing to the furthest the doctrine of excommunication: a young Baptist woman of Brecknock out of communion with the Church had her body exhumed from the churchyard of Bryn Pabuan, and buried at cross-roads like a common suicide; the corpse of an old helpmate of Vavasor Powell in the days of the Propagation and Protectorate was allowed to remain unburied for ten days in the churchyard of Llangollen[5]; most unchivalrous of all, excommunication was invoked to prevent Dissenting appellants from presenting their case at the Assizes of Flint.[6] Troops of soldiers were employed at Kenfig in Glamorgan and at Ysgafell in Montgomery to harry suspected nonconformists (in the former case before clause x

1 *Diaries*, p. 389.
2 On 24 August, 1680, died Colonel Thomas Blood (of whom more anon). No Puritan writer seems to have troubled to draw any moral from *his* demise.
3 Part i, 28 (col. 1); confirmed by Dr. W. A. Shaw: *Hist. Eng. Church*, i, 356.
4 Cp. *MS. J. Walker*, c, 1, f. 340, with *Suffs.*, ii, 406 (col. 1).
5 Philip Henry: *Diaries*, p. 305.
6 *ib.*, pp. 231-232 (it is pleasant to record that this ruse did not succeed).

of the first Conventicle Act had given sanction to the use of the military arm[1]). In the case of a Quaker in Pembrokeshire law and equity were shamelessly traversed in selling property to pay fines at ridiculous undervalues; and a barbarous lack of humour was displayed in taking away the last cow of an Arminian Baptist at Llanddewi Ystradenni, thus depriving his children of the milk they craved.[2] And were not eight lines of the epitaph designed for Dr. Thomas Goodwin excised by the Anglican authorities?[3] Was not Charles Edwards in his *Hanes y Ffydd* prevented from making any reference to the edition of the Bible brought out by Cradock and Powell in 1647, because of the eagle eye of the Oxford censor in doing his duty under the Licensing Acts? These, of course, are only representative examples chosen to throw light upon the extremer developments of the repression. For a conspectus of its whole machinery as wielded by the sheriffs and the officials of the consistory, and written with a wealth of vivid colouring, one must needs read the poetic effusion of Richard Pugh (a miller of Tredwstan in Brecknock), preserved for posterity in the pages of the Baptist historian Joshua Thomas.[4]

(v) Tests of Conscience.

Little removed from actual persecution were the importunities to conform addressed to Samuel Jones of Llangynwyd and John Evans of Wrexham, the former giving an answer that ranks as one of the most massive defences of the Puritan position ever penned.[5] Archdeacon Davies and Bishop William Lloyd probably felt it was a great pity that a former Fellow of Jesus and a sometime student of Balliol should be irretrievably lost to the Church of England. As to that mysterious letter sent on 3 January, 1664-1665, direct to Archbishop Sheldon by some anonymous churchman of Usk[6]—a letter accusing his Lordship the venerable Bishop of Llandaff of giving holy orders to a fanatical Catabaptist, a thatcher at that, 'and one that carried a musquet to

1 *C.S.P.*, 1663-1664, pp. 568-569 (Sir John Aubrey to Secretary Bennett, *26 Apr., 1664*).

2 Apart from those attested in the *Diaries* of Henry, most of these incidents are taken from the works of Joshua Thomas and Dr. Thomas Rees. The evidence behind each of them seems irrefragable.

3 Calamy: *Continuation*, i, 90-91.

4 Pontypridd edn., pp. 42-45.

5 Given in full in Dr. Thos. Rees: *Hist. Prot. Noncon.* (1883 ed.), pp. 232-235.

6 *Bodl. Addit. MS.* c. 302, f. 121 (Dolben Papers).

Worcester against his sacred Majesty '—it only proves that the ubiquitous supervision of the Bishop's officers had caused that former firebrand to take the line of least resistance, and do *after* the Act of Uniformity what so many had done *before* it. Thus did persecution make strange bedfellows.

III.

WINTER'S HARVEST.

(i) Henry Coleman.

As an illustration of how the rigours of the time had trodden out the lines of doctrinal demarcation, it behoves us to hearken to the words of Henry Coleman of Essex who, in applying for a licence on 14 May, 1672, alleged he had laid aside his ministry in 1662 on account of some coincident sickness, not forgetting some things in use he could not agree unto with peace of conscience. He said he had not preached since that time either in public or in private; as for his convictions on discipline and church government, '*I doe accord with ministers either episcopall presbiteriall or independant so farre as scripture and scripturall sense goeth.*'[1] An M.A. of Cambridge he may have been and 'an ancient preacher of the gospell of Christ,' but also a true Laodicean separated by a very thin partition from the official conformists; by his latitudinarian appeal he proclaimed himself a near spiritual relative of that Sussex minister who had run the whole gamut of transformation from Congregationalism to Anglicanism, from Presbyterianism to Popery.[2]

(ii) Concordats.

Keeping strictly to those who stood out for nonconformity, Restoration Wales boasted few Laodiceans and fewer vicars of Bray. Nevertheless, seriously affected though they were in person and pocket, they were still more affected in polity—a development eloquently described in the conventicle returns of 1669 which are preserved in *Lambeth MS.* 639. Who would predict when Miles—amidst the apostacy of friends, the division caused by the acceptance of State pay, and the virile attacks of the Quaker invaders—was

1 *St. Pap. Dom.*, Chas. II, 321, doct. 137. Dr. W. B. Selbie in his *Nonconformity* (Home Univ. Lib., p. 131), falls into the error of saying that Coleman's application was a *typical* one. The happy truth is that it stood by itself.

2 Calamy: *Acct* (1713), ii, 689.

unflinchingly riveting the chains of a quasi-Presbyterian system upon the strict Baptists of South Wales, that those chains would be torn asunder by the pressure of the dolorous days that came in the wake of 1660? And yet such a consummation is abundantly proved by the Nottage concordat, according to which a disciple of Miles taught side by side with a disciple of Cradock, and by the Baglan conventicle in which Baptists listened with Independents to the preaching of Robert Thomas (three years before 1669 Thomas had organised the Cilfwnwr church of Bapto-Independents).[1] Whatsoever Baptists existed in the three valleys converging on Goitrehen in the parish of Bettws must have occasionally found rest and refuge under the roof of Samuel Jones and his father-in-law. At Merthyr Henry Williams did his best to minister to the Independents and Baptists (who came together to the number of 600 sometimes, says the informer) that once had Jenkin Jones as leader. All over Monmouth, except at Abergavenny, we find 'free' Baptists and Independents worshipping together in secret; at Abergavenny itself, the two schools of Baptists attended the one conventicle alternately held at the house of John Edwards the shoemaker and that of Richard Jones the tailor. A Sabbatarian Anabaptist from Magor had free access to several meeting-places in south-eastern Monmouth. The conventicle of Eglwysilan furnished a centre for both Independents and those Baptists who afterwards formed the churches of Gelligaer-Hengoed.[2] Almost everywhere the forces of persecution drove Baptists and Independents into the folds of compromise. Acute differences had to be submerged.

(iii) Rhydwilym.

Too close a concentration on *Lambeth MS.* 639 will pay too great a compliment to the sagacity of the Llandaff informers and forget the successful stratagems by which some dissenters evaded the search of their enemies. East of the town of Abergavenny at Llantilio Pertholy dwelt William Prichard,[3] a disciple of Miles since 1650; though his career as a Baptist was not altogether unchequered, he

1 *Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 187b; see also *Trans. Hist. Soc. Bapts. of Wales* (1916-1919), pp. 55-56.
2 All these statements will be found on ff. 186-188b of the *Lamb. MS.*
3 Inference from *St. Pap. Dom., Chas. II, Entry Book* 38*A*, p. 232 (it was there he lived in *1672*).

seems to have abjured the company of the hybrid Baptists of the neighbouring town, and either to have held forth to a secret but undiscovered meeting at his own house or have looked for salvation among the inaccessible mountains which girded the Olchon-Clodock enclave (in the latter case he would fall to be reported in the diocese of St. David's, whose returns have not found their way into the Lambeth manuscript). In any case, there arrived in that romantic home of the 'close' Baptists about 1665-1666 a stranger from Carmarthenshire named William Jones, an erstwhile Puritan rector who had, suggests Joshua Thomas, seen new light on the ordinance of baptism within the walls of Carmarthen prison.[1] He was baptised in the Olchon brook by either William Prichard or Thomas Watkins. In 1668 both these ministers followed him to Rhydwilym, where on 12 July they organised a new body of the strictest of strict Baptists, so strict indeed that in adopting Vavasor Powell's confession of faith they unceremoniously dropped the article which allowed good men baptized in infancy to come to the Lord's Table.[2] Before the Indulgence of 1672 was issued William Jones had baptised no less than 62 persons, drawn mainly from people who had hitherto listened to the ministrations of the Independent Stephen Hughes or to the 'catabaptist' Jenkin Jones at Cilgerran. Rhydwilym became the fecund nucleus around which gradually grew the prosperous Baptist churches of south-western Wales. This unexpected reassertion of the narrow and exclusive dogma of John Miles, the Miles who had fled to America in 1663 and who was not always in his new home consistent with his old doctrine,[3] is the most interesting development in Wales during the era of conventicles. An exception to the rule it may be, but a very wonderful exception, both in its abhorrence of coalition and in the apparent geographical absurdity of re-carrying Miles' gospel to western Wales not along the old Baptist road of Ilston-Llanelly-Carmarthen but by the zigzag route of Ilston-Abergavenny-Olchon-Rhydwilym. All done under the noses of the informers. Not less interesting were two Quaker-like adaptations of this new community: their own

1 *Hanes y Bedyddwyr*, pp. 318-320.
2 Cp. *Life of Vavasor Powell* (1671), p. 36, with p. 11 of the *Rhydwilym Register Transcript* at N.L.W.
3 Spinther James: *Hanes Bed.*, ii, 415-416.

private arrangements for burial-places and their own private celebration of marriages 'in y^e^ presence of God and us his people.'[1]

(iv) Submergence.

From these exceptional Baptists let us return to the rule. Reference has been made to Vavasor's Confession and to his baptism by Henry Jessey in 1655. Although the words of that Confession precluded re-baptising, confined the ordinance to thinking persons, and barred from the Lord's Table all who had not thus conformed to it, yet a generous addendum re-opened the door in the interests of brotherly love. At no time did that apostle let undue stress on the manner and subjects of baptism interfere with the broad and comprehensive toleration which characterised his gathered church in Montgomeryshire. It is quite natural, therefore, that when the St. Asaph informers found eight conventicles (other than Quakers) in this area, they were unable to fill up the 'sects' column in more than one of them.[2] There is never a word of Baptists. It is perhaps equally natural that before another generation was over the 'free' Baptists of Montgomery and Radnor had been overwhelmed by Quakers and Independents. Wherever in Wales Baptists of loose and invertebrate principles consorted with Independents, the former succumbed to the alchemy of assimilation: after the death in 1671 of William Thomas, the Monmouthshire leader of the 'open' Baptists and the adjutant of Cradock ever since the early days of Llanfaches, his causes began to dwindle away before the days of the Toleration Act; how parlous became the state of the Montgomery Baptists is painfully evident from the alternate system in vogue at Llanbrynmair[3]; the arrival of Henry Maurice in Brecknock gave an immense advantage to the Independents over the amorphous polity left as a legacy to the Baptists of the county by Jenkin Jones of Tymawr.

1 Spinther James: *Hanes Bed.*, ii, 491-494. In the Michaelmas term of 1693, four years after the passing of the Toleration Act, a decision was given in the King's Bench which virtually legalised marriages made in conventicles 'in the Face of their Congregation in the Presence of Witnesses' (*Reports 3 Levinz*, 376).

2 *Lamb. MS.* 639, ff. 139-139b.

3 Joshua Thomas: *Hanes y Bedyddwyr*, pp. 291-294.

(v) The Quaker Assimilation.

The vicissitudes of the Restoration period crushed out all schools of religious thought lacking in the grim dynamic of battle, and cleared the ground for that triangular duel between Independents, Quakers and 'strict' Baptists which gave zest to the Puritan history of Wales up to the Methodist Revival. While the low defences of the open Baptists let into their citadel the infant baptisers of Montgomery and Monmouth, surface similarities between Arminian free grace and the Quaker doctrine of the inner light (besides many accidental likenesses in organisation) placed the General Baptists of mid-Wales at the mercy of George Fox and his Friends, more especially because this peculiar body of Baptists seemed to live in an isolated world of their own.[1] Down in the south-west, similar depredations were made in a land where the preachers sent by Hugh Peters during the Propagation period made too short a stay, and where the valiant efforts of Peregrine Phillips failed to hold together his once prosperous gathered church of Llangwm[2] in face of the very strict Baptists who had their headquarters at Rhydwilym by the Black Cleddau. It is a significant fact that the first two men to be immersed by William Jones (in August 1667), came from Pembrokeshire, Griffith Howell of Narberth and Abel Bishop of Slebech. Of the advances made by Quakerism in the south of the county, no better proof is needed than the pugnacious contempt of a Tenby woman for 'Church bibles,' a woman who was drowned in coming to shore in Swansea Bay in March of that year 1667.[3] The Independency of the west quailed before the difficulty of two languages and the double attack of Baptists and Quakers.

The Quakers in turn had to suffer a repression even more odious and persistent than that of the other bodies of Dissenters; indeed, they had had a Conventicle Act all their own for two years before what is known as the first Conventicle Act was put into force.[4] One of the pleasant by-products of the Indulgence of 1672 was the setting free of that gallant band of Montgomeryshire Quakers, with

1 This subject is treated with greater detail in Chap. XX.
2 *Humble Representation and Address* (1656), p. 9 [B.M. copy].
3 *Exts. from St. Paps. relating to Friends* (1654-1672), ed. Penney, p. 263.
4 13 and 14 Chas. II, cap. 1 (*Stat. at Large* [1734], p. 554).

Richard Davies of Cloddiau Cochion at their head, who had been continuously in and out of prison for the space of ten years.[1] During the unlovely atmosphere of the Clarendon Code the Friends allowed no diminution of their wonderful zeal in perambulating the country: though Thomas Holmes, their first crusader to South Wales, died at St. Fagans in 1666,[2] George Fox in person came to the eastern border in 1667, and might very well have been one of 'the eminent seducing preachers' who visited the Quaker meetings of Llanfihangel Ystern Llewern at the house of John Beales.[3] With their open-air activities they were particularly expert in finding loopholes in the Conventicle Acts. And no body, albeit attaching so much importance to manifestations of the inner light, was more compactly knit together by external expedients than the Quakers, as witness their monthly meetings and the yearly conferences (in which Wales took the lead in 1682[4]).

(vi) The Language Barrier.

But the inherent disadvantage of their system, as far as the principality was concerned, lay in the overshadowing of the native element by the English leaders: it never became thoroughly acclimatised on the Welsh hills. It was much the same with the Presbyterian ideal imposed by Scotsmen upon the unwilling shoulders of Southern Britain as one of the reactions of the first Civil War. Still less did the classical system, as a system, secure an effective lodgement in Wales outside the bounds of English Flint. Whether the numerous 'Presbyterian' licences that came west of Offa's Dyke in 1672 were due to the careless pencraft of Whitehall clerks or to the sincere convictions of the applicants, is one of the problems that awaits solution in the course of the present work. At this point it will suffice to say that the Quakers of Wales (and those of England as well) took not the slightest notice of the Declaration of Indulgence.

1 *Exts. from St. Papers*, ed. Penney, pp. 346, 354.
2 *Carm. Antiq. Soc. Trans.*, xiii, 47.
3 *Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 186.
4 W. C. Braithwaite: *Second Period of Quakerism*, p. 546.

(vii) Puritan Resiliency.

It is time to take up once more the tale of the Independents and Baptists, the Puritan sons of the Welsh soil. Not only was many a device adopted by the nonconformists to obscure the locale of the individual conventicles, testify as the *Lambeth MS.* does to the new brotherhood set up between many of the closest Baptists and the Independents, great diplomacy was also shown in keeping groups of conventicles in close organic contact. The Llandaff returns are particularly illuminating of this aspect. The old itinerant system beloved of the Propagators was once more revived: the preacher Thomas Quarrell visited no less than five secret meeting-places situated on the eastern borders of Glamorgan and the neighbouring districts of Monmouth, John Powell three, William Thomas four in Monmouth, Walter Prosser two, Watkin Jones two. To meet this emergency, meetings had to be held alternately at Llanedern every other Sabbath, at Bedwas every third Sabbath; it would not be easy for the most agile informer to find out with precision in which of the five conventicles in the uplands of Mynyddislwyn-Bedwellty one or more of the five 'teachers' who frequented them could be heard praying and preaching. At Llangwm, too, five different householders in an arranged cycle gave welcome to Baptist free communionists. Four houses at Llanwenarth were marked down by the Anglican informers. In the deanery of Netherwent there flourished the practice of 'repetition,' which can only mean the 'repeating' of sermons given by the prominent leaders in the greater conventicles by more obscure men in less accessible corners; it is rather curious that the people delegated to do this work were landed gentlemen of repute, some of whom had held high offices during the interregnum.[1]

(viii) The Contact with Bristol.

The old associations with Bristol were kept up across the Channel, where in 1665 almost a dozen ejected ministers had made their headquarters (Calamy adds two more who were stationed there about that

1 *Lamb. MS.* 639, ff. 186-188b, is the authority for the facts of this paragraph.

time),[1] and where almost a score of licences arrived in 1672.[2] It was to Bristol that Edward Herbert of Grange by Magor, a former Commissioner for the Propagation in South Wales, retired after having to disgorge part of the Marquis of Worcester's estates which were held by him ; and among the trustees of Herbert's lands named in his will was Thomas Ewins, pastor of Broadmead in Bristol, but at one time an active evangelist in south-eastern Monmouth.[3] Thomas Barnes, another Monmouth evangelist, had by 1669 moved *his* home from Magor to Bristol, only to travel back and fore across the Severn passages to encourage conventiclers in the moors of Netherwent.[4] Conversely, William Thomas of Llantrisant frequently crossed to baptise candidates at Broadmead or to give wholesome advice in the administration of that Bristol brotherhood. In this context, it comes very near probability that the pious Joseph Alleine of Taunton was meditating a visit to his old friend Samuel Jones of Llangynwyd when he was forestalled by weakness and death.[5] The State Papers supply evidence that the mouth of the Ogmore was crossed and re-crossed by dissenting preachers from Gloucester and Somerset, attending conventicles and mixing religion with more worldly business.[6] That, however, was as far back as 1664.

(ix) Borders.

To return to 1669 and re-affirm a point touched upon already, the Llandaff returns in the *Lambeth MS.* afford ample evidence of the tendency to have secret meeting-places so situated that a hurried flight could be made from one county to another where the writ of the first sheriff would not run—a manœuvre specially legislated against by clause xiii of the second Conventicle Act.[7] That in turn could not prevent the phenomenal number of 220 nonconformists being found in 1676 in the Border district of Clodock.[8]

1 *Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 317 ; *Account* (1713), ii. 610. The most interesting of these was a [Richard] Blinman, Blinman or Blindman, a minister ejected from Chepstow in 1662, and who in Sept., 1638, was one of five witnesses in whose presence the last will and testament of William Wroth of Llanfaches was sealed (*Trans. Cardiff Naturalists' Soc.*, xxv, pt. ii. 7).

2 G. Lyon Turner : *Orig. Recs.*, ii, 819, 824, 825.

3 W. R. Williams : *Hist. Parly. Repn. of Wales*, p. 124 ; Sir Joseph Bradney is responsible for the information about Herbert's will (kindly supplied to the present writer).

4 *Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 186b.

5 Samuel Clark : *Life* (1671), p. 33.

6 *C.S.P.*, 1663-1664, pp. 568-569.

7 *Docts. Act. Unif.*, ed. Gould, pp. 497-498.

8 *Salt MS.* (Stafford), f. 394.

IV.

NUMBERS.

(i) The Fallacies of a Professor.

Of the adaptation by the Dissenters of new and ever newer tactics to blunt the rapidly developing acerbities of the penal code, the conventicle returns are very instructive to those who look down the columns and between the lines; but any effort to rely on the same source for an estimate of their total strength in 1669, or for the relative numbers of the various sects, is bound to result in failure. Very often the column of numbers has no number whatsoever; many conventicles, and that rightly, are made to fluctuate between various maxima and minima; all estimates by the informers are given in round numbers; in some cases, as in the 600 maximum for Merthyr Tydvil, the informer has without much doubt been drawing somewhat upon his imagination. Notwithstanding these difficulties, the late Professor Lyon Turner was resolved to make the attempt. Unfortunately, he had not taken sufficient care that his transcript from the *Lambeth MS.* should be meticulously correct: in the deanery of Netherwent he made Nathan Rogers to harbour conventicles at Llanfaches and also at St. Bride's, while the MS. itself proves the latter to have been at the house of Thomas Jones of Milton; more serious still, by misapplying a bracket (}) on f.186*b* he has made the Quakers to have one meeting-place at Wilcrick and two at Shirenewton, while in the MS. itself they only frequented the house of John Jones at the former place.[1]

Quite as serious is the misinterpretation of entries when they *are* correctly transcribed. In the summaries of his third volume the Baptists of Glamorgan have disappeared altogether,

1 For proof of these statements, the reader is invited to examine side by side the original MS. and *Orig. Recs.*, i, 45-46.

although Lewis Thomas of Newton Nottage was very much alive; the whole body of the Monmouth 'open' Baptists has been delivered over to the Congregational column, at a time when their leader William Thomas was roaming over wide territory in the lower Usk hundreds and keeping open the Bristol communications with an old man's untiring fortitude. Even the conventicle of Llanwenarth, whose most prominent teacher was Morgan Evan the Quaker, are unnaturally transformed into Independents. Of the Baptists of Montgomery who accepted the broad communion basis of Vavasor Powell there is not a trace.[1] Though it must be admitted that the Monmouth and Montgomery 'open' Baptists were a spent force by 1689, it is far too soon to treat them as non-existent a full twenty years before that date. His tabulated totals based on the *Lambeth MS.* are totally indefensible (incidentally, this greatest statistician of 17th century Nonconformity avers he has no desire to play withn umbers, but it is very difficult to take him at his word[2]). How could the five houses of the Mynyddislwyn district harbour betwcen them 1000 hearers in 1669 if the census of 1676 only gives 38 sectaries to Mynyddislwyn and 30 to Bedwellty?[3] Even with the 50 of Aberystruth added in they would still be 82 short of the number actually entered on f. 187 of the MS. of 1669—which is 200 only. The learned Professor evidently took this number to frequent *one* house, and coolly multiplied it by 5. By such calculations he finds a total of 2,455 sectaries in the whole county; seven years later, with all the intervening indulgence, only 631 could be discovered. Even with the 578 Papists included, the total for 1676 would still be nearly 1,250 short of the Protestant conventiclers of 1669 as computed by the transcriber of the *Original Records.*

(ii) Correctives.

With all due respect to the monumental labour of a writer who has done more than any other to lighten up the darkness of the conventicle period, his attempts to analyse the situation in Wales has only led to inauspicious inexactitudes. Always be it remembered that the *Lambeth MS.* supplies

1 For these lapses, see *Orig. Recs.*, iii, 113.
2 *Orig. Recs.*, iii, 151.
3 *Salt MS.*, ff. 418, 420.

returns but for two dioceses, Llandaff in the South and St. Asaph in the North. The truth is that one must wait for Archbishop Sheldon's census before anything like a reliable estimate of the numerical strength of Nonconformists in Wales is possible (and even when those figures do come, they must not be accepted without subjecting them to very searching tests[1]). As to the particular districts in which the respective sects were relatively strong, as well as for the emergence of strict Baptists from under the shadow of the overpowering Independents, surer ground is reached in the *Entry Book* 38A which records the licences granted during the 'little summer' of the Indulgence. The deficiencies of informers and the mistakes of historians have contrived to minimise the intrinsic importance of the returns of 1669. Did not the industrious author of the *History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales*, another pioneer whose untutored research has nevertheless laid all later students in this field deeply in his debt—did he not, by copying the name of the preaching shoemaker of Abergavenny as *Watkin Morgan* instead of *William Morgan*,[2] lead himself and others to obscure the career of the William Morgan who received £20 as Propagation itinerant 'amongst the Welsh people,'[3] and who, surrounded by a list of his North Monmouth neighbours, subscribed the *Humble Address* to the Protector in 1656 ?[4]

(iii) The Cradock Tradition.

One thing they could not minimise—the continued strength of the Puritan movement in south-eastern Wales, in that angle of the principality most vulnerable to English influences (of 4,245 Nonconformists counted in the thirteen counties in 1676, those of Monmouth-Glamorgan-Brecknock came to 2,051, not far from one-half). Further, by the curious accident of their preservation, the Llandaff returns made by Anglican informers have silhouetted the personalities of two men, besides acting as an unconscious memorial of their abiding influence: William Wroth, the simple gospeller of Llanfaches, and his successor Walter Cradock, the great Puritan *politique* who so dexterously trod

1 This has been attempted by the present writer in the *Trans. Hon. Soc. of Cymmrodorion*, 1925-1926, Supplement, pp. 1-118.

2 1883 ed., p. 172; Spinther James: *Hanes Bed.*, ii, 475. Compare both with *Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 186—'Willm Morgan.'

3 *H.P.M.*, p. 150.

4 p. 13 (B.M. copy).

the dividing-line between things of the spirit and the affairs of this world, erected the single congregation into an all-sufficient unit of self-government, and coped so successfully with the manifold difficulties of the interregnum. In the days of Anglican censors Cradock's name, like that of the Protector he did so much to support, could only be whispered in secret places ; it was left to a Baptist historian to proclaim his virtues from the housetops,[1] and to the most learned leader of the Methodist Movement to give him and Wroth an honoured place in his gallery of Puritan divines.[2]

(iv) Vavasor's Personality.

Nor could the St. Asaph returns, even with their blank columns and incomplete entries, fail to lift into bold relief the personality of Vavasor Powell, equal in eminence to Cradock's, differing greatly in temperament, and still more so in politico-religious outlook. His death at the Fleet prison in October 1670, was the greatest event in the Puritan story of Wales between the reports of 1669 and the coming of the Indulgence. It is strangely pathetic that the man who had spent ten years since 1660 in prison, had suffered fourteen different imprisonments in the course of his life, had utilised his short freedom of 1667-1668 to preach in places as far distant as London, Llanfyllin and Merthyr Tydvil, had at the Cardiff-Cowbridge cross-examinations proved himself the same master of dialectic as in the old debates of Newchapel and Knighton, and had by the indulgence of his gaoler even held forth in 1669 to London conventiclers at Cherry Tree Alley on Bunhill[3]—it is, we add, poignantly pathetic he did not live to share the fortunes of Bunyan under the King's new benediction. Providence, however, has seen to it that his character and fame are safe for posterity as probably the most inexpugnable force in the whole annals of British Puritanism. How widely pervasive was his name is proved in two documents written within a very short time of his death. In the beginning of 1668 an obscure London spy pays the oblique compliment of calling him the ' great

1 Joshua Thomas : *Hanes y Bedyddwyr*, pp. 30, 32, 295-296.

2 *N.L.W. Add. MS. 128 C* (Thomas Charles' MSS.). Wroth is always down as ' Roth,' and on ff. 75, 79b, we read of ' Watkin Caradoc, M.A.' (two big mistakes, and one small one). The MS is, in the main, written by somebody other than Thomas Charles. It contains very interesting information, but some of it can easily be proved inaccurate.

3 For the facts thus summarised see *Lamb. MS.* 639, 139b, 220b ; *Life* (1671) pp. 132-142, 177-187.

metropollitan 5th monerchy preacher,'[1] which makes us call to mind Alexander Griffith's 'metropolitan of the itinerants'; in the August of 1669 a servant of the Bishop of Gloucester cannot describe the too flamboyant gestures of a preacher in Bristol Cathedral but as 'exactly vavasor powells.'[2]

(v) A Forecast of Difficulties.

If he had lived till 1672, would he have taken out a licence under the Declaration? Assuming the affirmative, would he have called himself a Baptist or an Independent? Though post-mortem inquisitions of this kind are classed, we admit, among the futilities of history, yet the suggestions underlying them—that some schools of Dissenters did *not* accept the Indulgence, that other groups were found masquerading on parchment under terms not fully connotative of their actual beliefs—will serve to introduce two of the most complicated problems in the Declaration records. But before attempting to attack these or any other allied problems, it will be necessary to say something of the subterranean tactics of the second Charles and to deal with the conflicting issues of policy which played so integral a part in the coming of the Indulgence of 1672.

1 *Extracts of St. Paps. relating to Friends* (1654-1672), ed. Penney, pp. 272-273 (letter from H.H. to Sir Robert Carr).

2 *Bodl. MSS. Add.* c. 302, f. 181 (George Evans to Miles Smith, from Gloucester, 21 Aug., 1669.)

V.

A ROYAL TACTICIAN.

(i) Accommodation.

In the light of what has been already said of happenings in Wales it is idle to deny that the penal code of the Restoration bore very hard upon the hapless Dissenters. On the other hand, it is equally foolish to assert that religious persecution in this country has ever attained to the fine art exemplified by the Inquisition in Spain and by the *Dragonnades* in France. During the first decade after 1660 it lacked thoroughness of system; often it raged fiercely in certain localities, while others escaped immune; political exigency supplied breathing-spaces; we have noticed how loopholes of liberty were discovered by the ingenuity of the persecuted.

No doubt Archbishop Sheldon and Chancellor Clarendon had a sincere passion for uniformity and all the will in the world to invest the Act of 1662 with its full panoply of legal implication. In David Loggan's fine engraving both men are portrayed as holding up the authority of King Charles—*scriptura et leges sunt fundamenta coronae.*[1] But that King was himself no persecutor; and the prerogative of the Crown was being continually exercised to undermine and neutralise the ambitions of his most devoted servants. At the end of the year which saw the sufferings of 'black Bartholomew,' Charles issued the declaration of 26 December, suggesting addenda to the Act of Uniformity and amendments to it which would enable Dissenters to contract out of its main provisions.[2] Though this was negatived by Sheldon and the bishops, the idea was not abandoned: for a bill was introduced into the Lords on 23 February, 1663, one of whose clauses

1 Vernon Staley: *Life of Sheldon*, copy facing p. 112. This engraving appeared as the frontispiece of a book on printing published in 1664.
2 Edward Cardwell: *Docty. Annals*, ii, 265-266.

broached for the first time the possibility of the King dispensing with the Act of Uniformity by granting *licences* to peaceable nonconformists for the exercise of their particular mode of worship.[1] This was again wrecked—by Clarendon, Sheldon, and the bishops. This successful torpedoing of both declaration and bill is usually said to have begun the King's coolness towards his Chancellor; certain it is that at the latter's fall in 1667 it was alleged by Vavasor Powell that the door of Southsea prison was then swung open for him and for many other petitioners.[2] A door was also opened for the King to re-declare his attitude in a very unmistakable manner: in October of that year he recommended the Cavalier Parliament to adopt healing and moderate counsels; in the following January he was undoubtedly at the root of renewed negotiations for accommodation, a design frustrated (as usual) by the intransigent Anglicanism of the Parliament; in the month of February, at the opening of a new session of this Parliament, he adjured the members to think of a better union and composure of his Protestant subjects; in September he had an interview with the leading Presbyterian 'dons' at the Earl of Arlington's lodgings, in which he reminded them of his genuine desire for toleration, and said it was only a matter of time. Five months before that he was able by a dexterous adjournment of Parliament to prevent a bill being passed for the continuance of the expired Conventicle Act of 1664. Parliament did not meet again till October 1669; and when an effort was made to revive the aforesaid Act, it was once more prorogued before such a bill could pass through both Houses.[3]

(ii) Facing Both Ways.

It is very unlikely that this reiterated use of the royal prerogative would escape the notice of the Dissenters. It was a very general impression that the King was with them. It is true that twice in 1668 he was forced by the Commons to issue proclamations ordering the strict enforcement of the penal laws; it is true also that Archbishop Sheldon was able to say in his letter ordering the conventicle returns of 1669 (letter dated 8 June) that the King spoke

1 Frank Bate: *Decl. of Indulgence*, pp. 37-39; *D.N.B.*, xlviii, 340-341 (article by Sir Charles Firth on "Lord Robartes").
2 *Life* (1671), p. 132.
3 For the grounds of this summary, see Bate: *Decl. of Indulgence*, pp. 57-65.

much against 'disorderly' religious meetings and expressed indignation against all reports of his connivance of them: but it is also a fact that the fifth query sent forth by him in that letter was unto the alleged impunity to Dissenters and unto what grounds they had for expecting it.[1] In due course the answers came, the answers summarised in *Lambeth MS.* 639. One of them, emanating from London, made the mistake of saying that conventicles had increased 'since the Rigo^{r} of y^{e} Oxford Act [Five Mile Act] was suspended'[2]: from the diocese of Ely and other centres came the frank avowal that 'Rumo^{r} of Comp^{r}hension' and the 'K^{s} Connivance' lay at the root of the impunity[3]; while the 30 conventiclers of Oswestry who gathered around the ejected minister Rowland Nevett and the dispossessed schoolmaster John Evans were vaguely declared to be building their hopes on 'the example of London and other places in the Kingdome.'[4]

Undoubtedly the Dissenters had a comparatively easy time since the fall of Clarendon and the lapse of the first Conventicle Act (both events happening in 1667 made that year a veritable *annus mirabilis* to Papist and Protestant nonconformists)[5]; Vavasor Powell admits in October 1668 that preaching by Dissenters had been tolerated for 'many moneths' throughout the nation and that he himself had enjoyed that liberty in London and the country.[6] Yet it would be a dangerous fallacy to hold that the ex-Chancellor's religious policy had suffered an official change. The persecuting authorities were still plentifully supplied with the apparatus of attack. For many justifiable reasons the stern Cavaliers of Glamorgan seem to have enjoyed Vavasor's mordant reference to Clarendon as one who would have betrayed his King and country, but for all that they decided to keep the dangerous Puritan safely under lock and key, although he had been arrested at Merthyr a short time before on a blank warrant bearing the date 1665[7]; early in 1668 his activities in the London Blue Anchor Alley had been

1 G. Lyon Turner: *Orig. Recs.*, iii, 71-72.
2 f. 222.
3 f. 178.
4 f. 139b.
5 Lyon Turner (*O.R.*, iii, 45) says the Conventicle Act lapsed in December 1667 In the opinion of W. C. Braithwaite (*Sec. Period of Quakerism*, 52-53 and n. 1 at foot of latter page), it did not technically expire till 2 March, 1668-1669. He admits, however, it had been little used for some time before that date.
6 *Life*, p. 139.
7 *ib.*, pp. 134, 138, 142.

diligently watched by an 'intelligencer' named H. H., and that under the direction of Sir Robert Carr, Arlington's brother-in-law[1]; and the bailiff of Welshpool on 25 July, 1669, could barbarously disperse a number of Quakers who had met at Guilsfield in the house of William Lewis, basing their action on the unexpired statute 13 and 14 Charles II, cap. 1, clause ii.[2] Or did these Guilsfield Quakers feel the pinch of the new proclamation issued by the King nine days before? For the Privy Council (a far more illiberal body than the select Council of State) had on 30 June given order to the Judges to wait upon the Lord Keeper and after a joint consultation to inform the Council of the exact provisions of the Common Law for suppressing conventicles *without the help of the lapsed Conventicle Act.*[3] On 6 July John Brydall is solemnly registering the conclusions of the Judges,[4] with the result that the King on the 16th was compelled to give out a new edict in which he had to confess that nonconformists were meeting in greater numbers than formerly, and to order J.P.'s to put the existing laws into operation against such meetings (more especially against ministers who were transgressing against the Five Mile Act).[5]

(iii) Dispensing Power.

Even in this very proclamation of July the same King managed to refer to his 'known and still avowed easiness to indulge tender consciences.' However, all Charles' subtleties could not prevent the very severe second Conventicle Act becoming law in 1670; but his friends in the two Houses made a valiant effort to insert in it a proviso securing him all the rights and powers of the prerogative exercised or enjoyed by himself or his predecessors. This was not carried. In the upshot clause xviii was made to read that nothing in the Act should make invalid or void His Majesty's supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs.[6] And when the fervour and ferocity of the Commons would pass an *additional* Conventicle Act at the end of 1670, Parliament was again prorogued before the bill could pass through the two Houses.

1 *Exts. from St. Paps. relating to Friends*, ed. Penney, pp. 272-273 (quoting *S.P.Dom.*, Chas. II, 237, 140).
2 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 139.
3 Lyon Turner: *Orig. Recs.*, iii, 48.
4 *Tanner MS.* 44, f. 120.
5 Lyon Turner: *O.R.*, iii, 48 (quoting Wilkins' *Concilia*, iv, 588).
6 *Docts. Act Unif.*, ed. Gould, pp. 498-499.

It is safe to assume that no one would be more happy than the King to hear of the historic decision of Lord Justice Vaughan (John Vaughan of Trawscoed in Cardiganshire) upon *Bushell's Case* of 1670 that jurors could not be fined for giving judgments according to their consciences.[1] Charles II had very little love for religious persecution. But so difficult were the days in which he reigned, so commensurately tortuous was the royal mind, that Charles could deftly turn the waters of the penal code into his own mill: the more persecution Dissenters had to suffer, the more ready (he thought) they would be to enter the fold of the Indulgence he was quietly building for them. It is very significant that from the day of Bartholomew's to the issue of the Declaration of 1672, he never receded from the position that the dispensing power was 'inherent in Us.'

(iv) The School of Robartes.

Nor did the King lack support for his policy from prominent placemen. Some from conviction, some merely from an interested desire to applaud the tactics of their royal master. In 1670 died Albemarle, who as General Monck and during his later promotions was much of a Presbyterian predisposed in favour of religious comprehension; among the *Tanner MSS.* there is preserved a letter sent him in February, 1667-1668, by an unknown hand (the writer would not disclose his identity till he would receive some encouragement from the Duke's chaplain, upon whom he promised to call) asking him to use his influence to get the 'exiled' ministers restored to their livings.[2] Sir Orlando Bridgeman, the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, had distinguished himself in 1660 as a humane president of the regicide trials, and was not too busy on 10 October of that year to refuse an interview to Philip Henry, who was in some trepidation of mind over the probability of his having to surrender the living of Worthenbury to Sir Orlando's brother Henry, the former Anglican incumbent.[3] He was a very moderate Episcopalian.[4] Then there was the Earl of

1 Cobbett's *St. Trials*, vi, 999-1026; Grant Robertson: *Select Statutes, Cases and Docts.*, pp. 223-228.

2 Vol. 45, f. 272.

3 *Diaries*, pp. 71-72; see discussion *re* Act of September, *supra*, p. 23.

4 Osmund Airy (*Charles II*, pub. 1901, p. 190) declares Bridgeman lost the Seal because he absolutely refused to affix it on the Declaration. The truth is that Shaftesbury did not take Bridgeman's place until Nov. 1672, eight months afterwards (*Hatton Corr.*, i, 101, 102).

Anglesey, who as Sir Arthur Annesley had once been recommended by Thomas Wogan the regicide to be a member of the Militia committee in Carmarthen and Pembroke during the troubles of Poyer's rebellion in 1648.[1] Later he sat as member in one of the Protectorate parliaments, was elected to the Convention by the borough of Carmarthen,[2] became Earl in 1661, and had been prominent amongst a group of peers who attempted to soften the severities of the Act of Uniformity by allocating 'allowances' out of their old livings to dispossessed Puritan ministers.[3] Lord Holles was one of the 'five members' of 1642. The Earl of Bridgwater had a near relative who harboured at her town house Presbyterian conventiclers, a house licenced also under the Indulgence for Dr. Thomas Jacomb to preach in.[4] Of much more interest to Welshmen is the Lord Privy Seal. He was John, second baron Robartes, a Cornish nobleman who had espoused the Parliament's cause in the Civil War, and after the Restoration had become one of the most active advocates of toleration towards Dissenters: it was Robartes who actually fathered the dispensing bill of 1663 in the House of Lords, in which, let it be repeated, mention was first made of royal *licences* for nonconformist worship.[5] About 1657 his son Robert was married to Sarah Bodvel (much against the will of her father, it is true), heiress of one of the most intemperate Cavaliers in the whole kingdom, Colonel John Bodvel of Lleyn and Llaneigrad in Anglesey (later it will be seen what light is thrown by this marriage and by the Robartes attitude in religion upon the licence granted to Bodvel House in September 1672[6]).

(v) Caballers.

Of the motley group of peers who formed the Cabal, Buckingham was a gay Deist who had married the only daughter of Fairfax, the 'black Tom' of the Civil Wars; it was at Arlington's lodgings that the King had met the Presbyterian leaders in September 1668; Clifford the Lord Treasurer was a Papist, but it was he who secured a licence in June 1672

1 *Tanner MS.* 57, ff. 62, 64.
2 W. R. Williams: *Hist. Parly. Repn. of Wales*, pp. 53, 173.
3 *Docts. Act Uniformity*, p. 422.
4 Lyon Turner: *Orig. Recs.*, iii, 771-772 (Countess of Exeter); *Entry Book 38 A*, p. 41.
5 *D.N.B.*, xlviii, pp. 340-341.
6 *Entry Book 38 A*, p. 238.

for the uncompromising Dissenter Francis Bampfield,[1] besides using his large influence to get indulgences to several Devon ministers; Lauderdale was an old Presbyterian, busy just now in riveting the 'clanking Act' upon his co-religionists in Scotland, but quite ready to allow his secretary to give in at Whitehall an application for Joseph Dawson to preach at Leeds.[2] There remains Ashley, a master of craft and sadly lacking in fine scruples, always nevertheless a sworn foe to Anglican extremism, a prominent supporter of the abortive bill of 1663, the author of a memorial to the King in 1669 which shadowed forth a large measure of freedom to Dissenters.[3] Such a body—'half Papist, half fanatic'—would naturally magnify the King's prerogative, and abet his secret schemes for toleration. Each member, of course, from his own peculiar angle. Thus the royal tactician did not stand alone. He was surrounded by a group of other experts, some of whom as a matter of tactics founded the Party System and in the name of principle made Whig politicians the special sponsors of Religious Liberty. Ashley became first Earl of Shaftesbury for his services to Charles II. in 1671-1672.

1 *Entry Book 38 A*, p. 190.
2 *St. Pap. 321*, 186; *Entry Book 38A*, p. 126.
3 Bate: *Dec. of Ind.*, p. 64; A. A. Seaton: *The Theory of Toleration*, pp. 149-150.

VI.

THE ROMANIST FACTOR.

(i) The Discoveries of Lord Acton.

There is not much doubt that these secret schemes for toleration were cherished by the King and supported by an inner circle of the Cabal because they were meant to bring substantial benefit to the Papists, those devotees of the ancient faith whose days of comfort had been so sadly diminished by the Bond of Association and the Gunpowder Treason. For the King was in secret a Papist himself. A generation ago his clandestine attachment to the Roman Catholic cause was established by the researches of Lord Acton; and very recently documentary evidence has been quoted to prove that measures were taken before the actual Restoration in order to belittle the rumours of his conversion to Rome.[1] It was Lord Acton also, corroborated by the Italian writer Giuseppe Boero, who brought to light the visit to England in 1668-1669 of Charles' eldest natural son, a Jesuit novice discreetly hidden under the name of James de la Cloche.[2] Six years before this mysterious visit secret negotiations with Pope Alexander VII had been set on foot, having as their ultimate object the formation of an Anglican branch of the Roman Church[3]; and it is hardly necessary to recount the signing of the Secret Treaty of Dover in June 1670 by which a King of England (in the event of resistance from his Protestant subjects) was to establish Romanism as the state religion by the active help of 6,000 Catholic Frenchmen.[4] Penal laws and public

1 Alex. Robertson: *Life of Sir Robert Moray* (1922), pp. 100-104. It is from the *Clarendon MSS.* that the evidence is mostly taken.

2 John Pollock: *The Popish Plot*, pp. 25-27 (an excellent summary of Acton's researches).

3 *ib.*, pp. 24-25.

4 *ib.*, pp. 27-28. For a more lenient view of the transactions at Dover, see *Calendar of Treasury Books*, 1669-1672 (ed. Dr. W. A. Shaw), vol. iii, pt. 1, preface, lxvi-lxvii. For G. M. Trevelyan's strictures on Dr. Shaw's defence of Charles, see his *England under the Stuarts* (1925 ed.), p. 365, n.1. Mr. Godfrey Davies is equally critical (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xl, 288).

proclamations were to be made obsolete by the terms of a treaty only known to a handful of half a dozen.

(ii) Petitions.

In all conscience the lot of the Papists after 1660 was hard enough: before the end of 1670 there were altogether fourteen penal statutes bearing down upon them[1]; it must never be forgotten that the code of Clarendon made no distinction between Puritan and Papist Dissenters; and the latter were so put to it to evade the government censorship that they had to describe their books as published in Paris, etc., and affix wrong years for the date of publication.[2] This was the fate of men who had most loyally supported the King's father in the Civil Wars (none more valiantly so than the Welsh Catholics of the Raglan area), had had their estates 'decimated' by the Puritan sequestration committees, and had read with undisguised pleasure the reference to 'tender consciences' in the Declaration of Breda. How Papal nuncios, his own son, and the growing boldness of his brother York would dun the King's ears with the long tale of disappointment and try to rouse him into seriousness! A little shaft of light shot into the gloom when the Cavalier Lords on 10 June, 1661, upon a petition from aggrieved Catholics who met at Arundel House, appointed a committee to take the existing penal laws against them into consideration, and even ordered a bill to be proposed for their relaxation. But what with the fierce Protestantism of the Commons and the equally fierce objections of the Society of Jesus to be excepted from this bill's provisions, it had not the slightest hope of ever becoming law.[3]

Dr. Stoughton is of opinion that the Catholics under the leadership of the Earl of Bristol warmly supported the Act of Uniformity on the ground that nothing promised so much advantage to them as the casting out from the Church of as many Puritans as possible: they drew the oblique consolation that the cumulative sufferings of this large number would strengthen the desire for *general* toleration.[4] And the King's declaration of 26 December, 1662, which was meant to mitigate

1 John Pollock: *The Popish Plot*, Appendix E., pp. 400-404.
2 *Life and Times of Anthony Wood* (ed. Clark), ii, 252 (and n. 3).
3 *Camb. Mod. Hist.*, v, 100.
4 *Church of the Restoration*, i, 251-252. He must have got this idea from Calamy *Acct.* (1713), i, 333, marginal note *.

the asperities of that Act, contained some significant statements designed to give the Papists new heart. After indignantly repudiating the charges of Papistry brought against him, he expatiated on the past loyalty of the Roman Catholics towards the Stuart cause, and how they had deserved well from him 'and even from the protestant religion itself' in preference to those who, 'under the name of zealous protestants, [had] employed both fire and sword to overthrow them both.' Was it just therefore, he asked, to deny them some part of that mercy which we have obliged ourself [that is, in this Declaration] to afford to ten times the number of such who have not deserved so? He warns them, however, not to expect unqualified toleration.[1] As we have already noticed, Parliament brusquely brushed aside the whole Declaration of December, and thus withered the hopes of both schools of Dissenters: concerning the Papists, they point out that should that Declaration become law it would take away all means of convicting recusants. The Commons proved they had gauged pretty accurately the true import of the Papist references in the Declaration.[2] Instead of the King's indulgence there came just over a month later (31 March, 1663) a petition from both Houses of Parliament appealing to the monarch to order all Jesuits and Popish priests to quit the realm. The King by granting the order virtually recanted his kind words of December. Three years later, arising from the suspicions aroused by the Fire of London, a similar petition was presented to the King asking him to put all laws against Roman Catholics in force. Neither petition was formulated into a bill that effectively passed through both Houses. The Jesuit missionaries in Monmouth and Flint had to lie low and walk warily. The day of expulsion had not come yet.

(iii) The Diplomacy of Arlington.

The double event of 1667—the fall of Clarendon and the practical expiry of the first Conventicle Act—was full of good omen to Papist no less than to Puritan; and it is possible that a certain loosening of the penal strings in Glamorgan led Vavasor Powell to suggest

1 Edward Cardwell: *Docty. Annals*, ii. 267.
2 *Docts. Act. Unif.*, pp. 474-475 (answer of the Commons adopted on 27 Feb., 1662-1663).

to his Cowbridge inquisitors in 1668 that they should bestow their attention first upon Popish recusants (incidentally he betrayed the wide chasm, unbridged by a common persecution, that separated Puritan and Papist by naming the latter in the same breath with drunkards, swearers, whore-mongers, and Sabbath-breakers).[1] At the beginning of this same year 1668 the leading London Presbyterians were told that if they wanted to succeed in their efforts at comprehension within the Church, 'they must make use of those who would indulge Papists also'[2]; but when the King's speech came to be read early in February, there was not a word about increased toleration to Roman Catholics. Charles was too wise to batter his head against the stone walls of the Cavalier Parliament. Just a few Popish meetings found their way into the conventicle returns of 1669, although the Archbishop did not include them in his terms of inquiry: 40 Papists were reported at Hanmer in English Flint.[3] Another such group in Derbyshire declared (according to an informer) that they based all their hopes on the clemency of the King and Parliament.[4] They had excellent grounds for one part of their hopes if the German historians Brosch and Ranke are correct in describing the papal 'internuncio' at Brussels coming over to England just about this time, enjoying the hospitality of the Venetian ambassador, and meeting in private interview the King, Queen, James of York, and the Earl of Arlington[5]; probably Edward Cardwell's dicta (depending on the *Stuart Papers*), that Charles in 1669 secretly promised to bring in the Romish faith and arranged with his brother to go about it as wise men and good Catholics ought to do, refer to the same juncture of time and occasion.[6] Arlington, let it be noted, was present at the alleged meeting with the nuncio; he was also one of the signatories of the Secret Treaty of 1670; to him also was delegated the working of the Declaration of 1672.

1 *Life*, p. 137.
2 Bate, pp. 59-60.
3 *Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 287b.
4 *ib.*, f. 192.
5 Quoted in John Pollock: *The Popish Plot*, p. 27 (and n. 2).
6 *Docty. Annals*, ii, 282-284.

(iv) Conflicting Issues.

The effect of this Arlingtonian ensemble is unmistakably to lay a premium on the pro-Papist milieu of the Indulgence. A high Anglican like Cardwell has no doubt it was really designed to relieve the Catholics, and Canon Venables in his article on Bunyan adopts the same view.[1] On the other hand, the Nonconformist historian Stoughton confines his remarks to the Dutch problem—how war with Holland was impending, how that country had given refuge to English regicides and an asylum for Bartolomean ministers, and how the disaffection of Puritan Dissenters was growing into a very sinister menace at the beginning of 1672.[2] With all his wide knowledge of the politico-religious history of the period, Professor Lyon Turner seems unable to make up his mind whether its main motive was anti-Dutch or pro-Papist.[3] The preamble to the Declaration itself says not a word either of Papists or of Holland, but it *does* point out the advantage of inviting strangers to live in a land of toleration, and the encouragement thus given to all to a cheerful following of their trades and callings. Pollock puts the case comprehensively when he says that the Indulgence sprang from the desire to obtain the support of Dissent for the Dutch war,[4] and to pave the way for a successful issue of the Catholic policy at its close.[5] Even assuming this to be the right solution of a complex problem, the Papist preoccupation was wonderfully well camouflaged. At the risk of anticipation, we cannot forbear noting that the Declaration, after all, made mightily little difference to the penalised Catholics. Its fifth section sounds as if it had come red-hot from the hands of Clarendon.

The Papist issue must take its place as one out of many. If freedom to Romanists was the ultimate object of the King, it was assuredly not Shaftesbury's. And if it be assumed that Charles first conceived the idea of Indulgence, it is practically certain it was Shaftesbury who penned the Declaration. Later, it is true, that wily politician found reasons to regret

1 *D.N.B.*, iii, 280.
2 *Church of the Restoration*, i 401-402.
3 *Orig. Recs.*, iii, 152-159.
4 In this context one is disposed to quote Pepys' remark of five years before, just when the Dutch had been burning English ships at Chatham: 'nothing but this disaster] will unite us together,' *i.e.*, unite Church and Dissent (*Diary*, ed. Gregory Smith, p. 507, June 13, 1667).
5 *The Popish Plot*, p. 28.

the part he had taken in it and to appreciate more fully its political reactions at home and abroad. The very gradual growth of these convictions upon the mind of that long-eared courtier proves with what scientific circumspection the King and his coterie of Caballers had moved. Never hitherto, however, has a great ecclesiastical revolution, in this case no less than the transforming of the Church of England into a department of the Church of Rome, been achieved by keeping the ball close and publishing Declarations giving a large measure of liberty to those very religionists who would oppose such a revolution to the death. To his last hour Charles never admitted he was a Papist. His brother James thought he was the man for the hour. When he came to the throne as James II he played the open game, and lost his crown.

VII.

HOPES AND FEARS.

(i) Interviews.

There is no mistaking the growing hopes of the Dissenters during the year 1671. On 24 August, the ninth anniversary of St. Bartholomew's, Philip Henry was present at a solemn fast in remembrance 'of y^e^ sad day of Min^rs^ ejections' held at the house of the Countess of Exeter in Little Britain, where five preachers prayed and preached alternately. The texts were all from the Psalms, varying from the submissiveness of xxxix, 9, to the fearless candour of lvi, 4. On the 27th he preached at the meeting-place of Thomas Doolittle in Monkwell Street; on the 30th at Westmoreland House, where his friend Richard Steele had his London headquarters; on 7 September he was one of about 100 or 120 Dissenting preachers who were openly present at the funeral of a nonconformist minister.[1] Before the end of that same year John Hickes of Kingsbridge in Devon, surely one of the most adventurous characters in the whole history of the Church of Christ,[2] brother-in-law to John Howe of the 'Living Temple,' a man who was fourteen years later to suffer death at Glastonbury for his part in the rebellion of Monmouth, and to receive but a very niggardly reference in the pages of Macaulay[3]—Hickes managed to see the King face to face and picture to him in nervous English the indefensible actions of the Devonian persecutors. He returned to the West Country with the King's pardon in his pocket for his activities as political plotter and the promise of a considerable remission of the fines he had paid by force of the conventicle laws.[4]

1 *Diaries*, pp. 241, 242.

2 For a wonderfully revealing account of this worthy, see G. Lyon Turner: *Orig. Recs.*, iii, 578-618.

3 *Hist of England*, i, 312-313 (Longmans ed., 1895).

4 The pardon was dated January, 1671-1672, for treasons etc. committed since 29 May 1660 (*Calendar of Treasury Books*, vol. iii, pt. 2, p. 1169). The remission of fines was ordered just a year later. The sum remitted amounted to £166 15s. 8d., being the King's 'third' of the moneys levied upon Hickes and other Devonshire dissenters (*ib.* vol. iv, 48, 69).

Such a perilous interview would not be bruited abroad. Nor would the comings and goings of Presbyterian ministers, both 'dons' and 'ducklings,' to meetings arranged with the King at Whitehall.[1] Toleration was evidently in the air. In the air, it may be. The next paragraph will show that the wheels of the generating machinery were turning around very merrily out of sight.

(ii) Three Rogues?

It was of the greatest importance that the Dissenters of the capital should be sounded on the expediency of an Indulgence (later it will be seen that large numbers both in London and the provinces had rooted objections to the kind of freedom Charles had in view), and it is these subterranean negotiations that account for the dramatic emergence in Williamson's diary of three characters, interesting enough individually, very bizarre in juxtaposition—Nicholas Butler, James Innes, Thomas Blood. The first was a doctor of medicine who had done yeoman service in London at the time of the Great Plague, and no doubt had come into frequent touch with the troop of nonconformist ministers who stayed in town during that tragic time[2]; James Innes, an ex-Presbyterian minister, was once a Lieutenant-Colonel in the army of Charles I, now on excellent terms with his fellow-Scot Lauderdale, and married to a sister of the two Vincent brothers (Thomas and Nathaniel)[3]; Thomas Blood was the daring Puritan adventurer who had almost succeeded in dragging the Marquis of Ormonde to the gallows at Tyburn in December 1670, had all but carried away the Crown jewels from the Tower in May 1671, and had been mysteriously pardoned by the King (and not pardoned only, but made his confidant).[4] Emphatically a curious trio, abounding in anomalies of character. Before the end of 1672 Dr. Butler was using his new influence at Whitehall to get the King's dispensation for a second marriage he had contracted while his first wife was alive. Blood had bought out his many outlawries by becoming the King's most loyal subject. Yet

1 Bate, p. 74.
2 Lyon Turner: *Orig. Recs.*, iii, 160-218. This account is a 'tour de force' of research, and a great improvement on Bate's opinion (p. 91, n. 39) that Butler was an Anglican clergyman and a hanger-on of Prince Rupert. In his Vol. I, even Turner put his name down as *John*.
3 *ib.*, iii, 619-621.
4 *ib.*, iii, 223-224 et seq.; W. C. Abbott: *Col. Thomas Blood, Crown-Stealer*, 12-20, 65-71.

he was not forgetful of his Puritan antecedents. At every opportunity he regaled the ears of Charles with the unjustifiable sufferings of his co-religionists; indeed, it was through him that John Hickes secured access to the presence of the King. Innes, living within Axe Yard in Westminster King Street,[1] was kept so busy in doing backstairs work to further the King's new plans that he forgot to take out a licence for himself under the Indulgence. It was Innes and Butler that would sound the more respectable Presbyterians of the city[2]; to Blood, whom Philip Henry calls an abandoned Anabaptist,[3] was given the congenial duty of worming his way to the confidences of the extremer elements among Independents and Baptists. All three worked under the direction of Sir Joseph Williamson, Arlington's astute Chief Secretary. Astute he had to be with servants such as these three; he is driven in his diary to call the ex-Presbyterian minister now 'a shrewd fellow,' anon 'a great rogue.' It is not altogether likely that Innes was a greater rogue than either Butler or Blood. Williamson adds piquancy to the situation by reporting that the friends of Innes and Butler respectively had warned each of them to beware of the other, and that Butler was quite at sea as to how far he could trust Blood. It is interesting, but not very pleasant, to think that the path towards a religious proclamation was paved by three rogues. And was the proclaimer not the greatest rogue of all?

(iii) Cases of Conscience.

All Dissenters desired a genuine and constitutional toleration. A large number, if not all, had serious doubts regarding the legality and permanence of a freedom granted behind the back of Parliament; it is doubtful if any of them were highly enamoured of the particular gentlemen who came to them as Arlington's intelligencers. Whether one of these 'rogues' interviewed Dr. John Owen at his home in Charterhouse Yard, or the Montgomery-born George Griffith then living in Addle Street, or Dr. Thomas Goodwin at his house in the parish of Cripplegate, or went as far as Finsbury Court over against the artillery ground

1 *S.P. 320*, 34.
2 There is some evidence that a Presbyterian minister named *Joseph Church* was also found useful in this work (*O.R.*, iii, 187-188). A *Captain Gladman* figures in the account of Dr. W. T. Whitley (*Hist. Brit. Bapt.*, 122), but not as a Presbyterian.
3 *Diaries*, p. 237.

in Moorfields to call upon the Baptist leader William Kyffin,[1] we have no means of knowing. Certain it is that these non-Presbyterian chieftains betokened no enthusiasm over the King's plan. There is not the slightest ground for believing that the Independents held in 1672 what 'some' of them are alleged to have said in 1660—that it was better for the Papists to have liberty than for all dissenters to go without it if they opposed general toleration.[2] Not even the sufferings of twelve years had scourged the Independents to these heights. Coming to the Presbyterians, it is common knowledge that some of their members were kept well abreast of the negotiations. With them also the outlook was not regarded without deep misgivings, chiefly on account of the pernicious Papist dilemma that was ever before their eyes since the Restoration. Let Baxter be called Presbyterian for the nonce and act as their spokesman: 'such was the Policy of the Court that they must either be crush'd by their Fellow Protestants to the strengthening of the Popish Interest; or if favour'd with any Connivance, they must have the Papists partners with them.'[3] Pertinent in this context also are the remarks of the third Calamy in reviewing the difficulties arising from the issue of a second Indulgence in 1687: he said it could not be accepted by nonconformists without creating an unnatural alliance between liberty and infallibility.[4] Had not his grandfather (Edmund Calamy the Elder) in conjunction with Baxter practically wrecked all hope of accommodation with the King in 1660 by stubbornly closing their eyes to the claims of the Catholics? "You know that there are many dissenters, as papists, quakers, etc., for whom we never meddled."[5]

(iv) Strange Accusations.

This juxtaposition of Papists and Quakers is not strange. The sober Baptist who compiled the *Broadmead Records* roundly declared that the damnable doctrines of the Friends were promoted by the Jesuits[6]; Baxter himself

1 *S.P. 320*, 97 (Dr. Owen); *Entry Book 38A*, p. 7 (Goodwin), p. 43 (Griffith); *Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 219 (Kyffin).
2 Baxter is the authority for the statement (*Reliq. Baxt.*, 429-430, and quoted in *Docts. Act. Unif.*, p. 406). Unfortunately Baxter is quite undependable where Independents are concerned.
3 Calamy: *Abridgement*, i, 305.
4 Calamy: *Continuation*, dedication, xxvi-xxvii.
5 *Docts. Act Unif.*, p. 62 ('A Defence of the Proposals').
6 ed. Haycroft (1865), pp. 37-43.

affirmed that Franciscan friars had been proved to be disguised speakers in their assemblies (and even believed the 'secret spring' of the Levelling movement to be somewhere near Rome)[1]; and so general was this belief that a prominent Baptist pamphleteer named Henry Denne brought out a tract in October 1659 to prove that the Quaker was no Papist.[2] This absurd consortium of diametrically diverse elements was a figment of the years before 1660[3]; after that year it seems at first passing strange that Presbyterians (and other Dissenters as well) had to be very alert in combating allegations that they themselves were not a whit better than Papists. Anglican writers, concentrating their attack upon the Romish claim to political supremacy over kings, found something analogous to this in the theocratical tendencies of Presbyterianism, in the general Dissenting principle that there were circumstances in which it was lawful to take up arms against the Crown, and in the millenarian tenets that all monarchs were soon to sit at the feet of the Ancient of Days.[4] About 1665 Dr. John Owen, who ranked with Baxter as the weightiest controversialist among the ejected ministers, found it necessary to publish a pamphlet mainly devoted to showing that the Dissenters were irreconcilably opposed to Popery.[5] Even as late as 1682 a Master of Jesus in Cambridge was found gravely alleging that by their support of toleration the Presbyterians were playing into the hands of the Church of Rome, thus repeating from an Anglican standpoint what Baxter had said from the Presbyterian.[6] But this Cambridge don does not go so far as to call them Papists. Without pursuing this matter further, it can be said without hesitation that the Anglican argument from affinity strained the law of analogy to ridiculous excess, and showed to what lengths the new obsession of non-resistance would lead its supporters. To Philip Henry the Papists were the supreme enemy.[7] Another Presbyterian, Adam Martindale of Cheshire, was willing to forego toleration if

1 Calamy: *Abridgement*, i, 102. Cp. pp. 57-60, where Calamy has inserted a long footnote on the subject.
2 E. 1000.13 (Thomason Tracts, B.M.).
3 It sprung into vogue once more in the days of the Popish Plot (W. C. Braithwaite: *Soc. Per. of Quakerism*, 449).
4 A. A. Seaton: *The Theory of Toleration*, pp. 126-127. He does not apply his argument to the Fifth Monarchists.
5 *ib.*, p. 126.
6 *ib.*, p. 204.
7 *Diaries*, p. 250.

it meant toleration of Roman Catholics.[1] There was no real convergence between Geneva and Rome in 1672, and certainly no working agreement between Dissenters and Papists.

(v) Stranger Theories.

But according to A. A. Seaton, the author of a luminous account of the theory of toleration under the later Stuarts, the Dissenters in 1672 *were* in alliance with the *Church of England.*[2] Assuredly this is a very serious misapprehension of the real facts. Sheldon was still Archbishop, he who had complained in 1662 of the too wide door opened for Presbyterians by the Bartholomew Act, had at the end of August 1662 beaten down the arguments of those who sought to modify that Act,[3] and in May 1670 had in a circular letter to the bishops hoped that in a few months ' by God's help and the assistance of the civil power ' seduced people and seditious teachers would return to the unity of the Church.[4] Was it not one of his secretariat, Ralph Snowe by name, who on 30 April, 1672, was sending an urgent note to Arlington's lodgings to prevent a licence being granted (' if none such have passed ') to Oliver Heywood at Halifax, one of the most pious Dissenters in the whole country ?[5] And if there be any truth in the story, fathered by Stillingfleet and spread abroad by Burnet, that certain nonconformists received bribes (or pensions) from the Court to accept the Declaration and abstain from raising an outcry against Popery, that would only prove an alliance with the Court, not with the Church. Again, how does Seaton's contention on p. 232 agree with the pro-Catholic motives he assigns to Charles on p. 181 ? For if there existed a close union between Church and Dissenters, that policy would die a natural death, and the poor Papists would be jockeyed out of all hopes of alleviation. What, in the face of this theory of Seaton's, is to come of those writers who put down the Papist issue as the dominating factor in 1671-1672 ? To sum up the situation on the eve of the Indulgence : the

1 W. C. Braithwaite : *Second Period of Quakerism*, p. 82 (and n. 5).
2 *The Theory of Toleration*, p. 232 (*more especially n. 2*).
3 *Docts. Act. Unif.*, pp. 407-408.
4 Lyon Turner : *Orig. Recs.*, iii, 53-55 (letter dated 7 May).
5 *S.P. 320*, 211. That Snowe was one of the Lambeth officials is conclusively proved by the Dolben Papers (*Bodl. MSS. Add.* c. 304a, f. 117 ; 305, ff. 331-331v), and by the *Tanner MS.* 146, ff. 87, 90, 94. According to the present Lambeth Librarian, Snowe was steward of the episcopal manors (*Eccl. Records* (1920), p. 38). Heywood's licence had ' passed ' ten days before the letter arrived (*Entry Book* 38A, p. 35).

Papist design *did* exist, but only as one factor in a big problem ; good Dissenters dreaded the Declaration because of the dilemma which haunted them ; Anglican sentiment wholeheartedly abhorred the whole project.

Adopting a view-point far different from Seaton's theory of a bargain between Church and Dissenters, an American writer who has paid considerable attention to this period has described the Declaration as an ' arbitrary ' act of the King, disregarding the evidence of long discussions in Council and seemingly unaware of the subterranean soundings of Butler and Blood.[1] It would be well for this transatlantic historian to examine well the evidence adduced by Frank Bate on pp. 79-80 of his work on the Indulgence. That would save him from casting too much responsibility on that overburdened word ' arbitrary.' *Arbitrary* it was in the sense that Parliament was not consulted, but not *arbitrary* in the sense that its content and consequences were not thought out with some thoroughness. A later chapter will show how the nimble minds of nonconformists played havoc with those aspects of its operation which had *not* been adequately prepared for.

Before coming to the actual text of the Declaration it is well to note that with some additions the men prominent in 1672 were much the same as those behind the futile bill of 1663 (the King himself, Shaftesbury, Arlington, Robartes) ; there was the same complexity of motive—toleration to Dissenters, favour to Papists, a united front to the Dutch ; and the Indulgence of 1672 attempted to do by a mere Declaration what the men of nine years before had failed to achieve because of the adamantine attitude of the House of Commons.

1 W. C. Abbott in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxi, p. 55 (part 1 of an article on the ' Long Parliament of Charles II ').

VIII.

TEXT.[1]

The Declaration (or, as it is invariably termed by Anthony Wood, 'Act of Toleration')[2] was issued on 15 March, 1671-1672, and was worded as follows (the words in brackets are added for later references) :—

CHARLES REX.

[PREAMBLE]. "*Our care and endeavours for the preserva-*" "*tion of the rights and interests of the Church have been*" "*sufficiently manifested to the world by the whole course of our*" "*government since our happy restoration, and by the many*" "*and frequent ways of coercion that we have used for reducing*" "*all erring or dissenting persons, and for composing the*" "*unhappy differences in matters of religion, which we found*" "*among our subjects upon our return ; but it being evident*" "*by the sad experience of twelve years that there is very little*" "*fruit of these forcible courses, we think ourselves obliged*" "*to make use of that supreme power in ecclesiastical matters*" "*which is not only inherent in us, but hath been declared and*" "*recognised to be so by several statutes and acts of Parliament ;*" "*and therefore we do now accordingly issue this our declaration,*" "*as well for the quieting of our good subjects in these points,*" "*as for inviting strangers in this conjecture*[3] *to come and live*" "*under us ; and for the better encouragement of all to a*" "*cheerful following of their trades and callings, from whence*" "*we hope, by the blessing of God, to have many good and*" "*happy advantages to our government ; as also for preventing*" "*for the future the danger that might otherwise arise from*" "*private meetings and seditious assemblies.*"

1 The terms of the Declaration of 1672 can be examined in several sources, especially in (i) Frank Bate : *Declaration of Indulgence*, pp. 76-78.
(ii) Daniel Neal : *History of the Puritans*, iv, 461.
(iii) Grant Robertson : *Select Statutes, Cases and Documents*, p. 42.
Those who insist on seeing the original Declaration in its full panoply of capital letters must look up *St. Pap. Dom.*, Chas. II, Vol. 304, No. 1.

2 *Life and Times*, ii, 244.

3 Sic.

[Section 1]. "*And in the first place, we declare our*" "*express resolution, meaning and intention to be, that the*" "*Church of England be preserved, and remain entire in its*" "*doctrine, discipline and government, as now it stands*" "*established by law; and that this be taken to be, as it is, the*" "*basis, rule, and standard of the general and public worship*" "*of God, and that the orthodox conformable clergy do receive*" "*and enjoy the revenues belonging thereunto, and that no*" "*person, though of a different opinion and persuasion, shall*" "*be exempt from paying his tithes or dues whatsoever. And*" "*further we declare, that no person shall be capable of holding*" "*any benefice, living, or ecclesiastical dignity or preferment*" "*of any kind, in this our kingdom of England, who is not*" "*exactly conformable.*"

[Section 2]. "*We do in the next place declare our will*" "*and pleasure to be, that the execution of all, and all manner*" "*of penal laws in matters ecclesiastical, against whatsoever*" "*sort of nonconformists or recusants, be immediately suspended,*" "*and they are hereby suspended; and all judges, judges of*" "*assize and gaol delivery, sheriffs, justices of peace, mayors,*" "*bayliffs and other officers whatsoever, whether ecclesiastical*" "*or civil, are to take notice of it, and pay due obedience thereto.*"

[Section 3]. "*And that there may be no pretence for any*" "*of our subjects to continue their illegal meetings and con-*" "*venticles, we do declare, that we shall from time to time allow*" "*a sufficient number of places as they shall be desired, in all*" "*parts of this our kingdom, for the use of such as do not*" "*conform to the Church of England, to meet and assemble*" "*in order to their public worship and devotion, which meetings*" "*shall be open and free to all persons.*"

[Section 4]. "*But to prevent such disorders and*" "*inconveniences as may happen by this our indulgence, if*" "*not duly regulated; and that they may be the better protected*" "*by the civil magistrate; our express will and pleasure is,*" "*that none of our subjects do presume to meet in any place,*" "*until such places be allowed, and the teacher of that*" "*congregation be approved by us.*"

[Section 5]. "*And lest any should apprehend that this*" "*restriction should make our said allowance and approbation*" "*difficult to be obtained, we do further declare, that this our*"

"*indulgence as to the allowance of the public places of*"
"*worship and approbation of the preachers, shall extend to*"
"*all sorts of nonconformists and recusants, except the*"
"*recusants of the Roman Catholic religion, to whom we shall*"
"*in no wise allow public places of worship, but only indulge*"
"*them their share in the common exemption from the penal*"
"*laws, and the exercise of their worship in their private houses*"
"*only.*"

[Section 6]. "*And if after this our clemency and*"
"*indulgence any of our subjects shall pretend to abuse this*"
"*liberty, and shall preach seditiously, or to the derogation of*"
"*the doctrine, discipline or government of the established*"
"*church, or shall meet in places not allowed by us, we do hereby*"
"*give them warning, and declare we will proceed against them*"
"*with all imaginable severity. And we will let them see, we*"
"*can be as severe to punish such offenders when so justly*"
"*provoked, as we are indulgent to truly tender consciences.*"

"*Given at our Court at Whitehall this* 15*th day of*"
"*March,*[1] *in the four and twentieth year of our reign.*"

1 According to the editor of the *Hatton Correspondence*, its contents did not become public property till the following day (i, 81, n. c).

IX.

INTERPRETATION.*

(i) The Ambit of Freedom.

It was not for nothing that Charles had in the xviiith clause of the Conventicle Act of 1670 insisted on the recognition by Parliament of his royal supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs. Under its shadow, in this month of March in 1672, the Supreme Head of the Church of England publicly proclaimed that the national church was not co-terminous with the nation ; by the same hand that had signed the various Acts of Clarendon's code and numberless proclamations against Dissenters was it admitted that a twelve years' persecution had proved a dismal and hopeless failure. Forcible courses, he said, had borne very little fruit, unconsciously echoing the aphorism of the younger Penn that the Tower was the worst argument in the world.[1] Such a statement, implying that Dissent had come to stay, amounted to no less than a revolution in English ecclesiastical history, a pronouncement which found its later complements in the two Declarations of his brother James and in the granting of legal toleration by his nephew William. The Declaration of 1672 involved the corollary that Dissent had a right to exist. Did not the King's licences give it more than an oblique benediction ?

Of course, lip service had to be paid to the doctrine and discipline of the official Church. We have the unedifying spectacle of a King Catholic at heart reciting his 'care and endeavours' for its preservation. Its basic government was to remain entire ; its dues and revenues were not to suffer any diminution or demur ; the Act of Uniformity was never to be observed with more meticulous exactness. With what scorn Archbishop Sheldon must have read the first

* From this point forward, full use will be made of the contractions explained in the Introduction.

1 A. A. Seaton : *The Theory of Toleration*, p. 23.

words in sec. 1—' we declare our express resolution, meaning and intention to be, that the Church of England be preserved '; and it was well for the intriguing Dr. Butler that Sir Joseph Williamson kept safely under lock and key the former's letter of the 22 March, in which he unctuously hoped the Church of England would still flourish, ' if they bee but prudent.'[1] It was certainly a piece of good tactics to tell the coming recipients of the new toleration in set round terms that any abuse of their liberty by seditious preaching or by derogation of the usages of the established church or by meeting in unlicenced places would be visited with ' all imaginable severity.' Nor did the preamble forget to refer to ' seditious assemblies ' in the same breath with ' private meetings.' At rolling out thunders from the stage Charles had an excellent voice. And Shaftesbury stood watching him from the wings.

Remembering the latter's memorial of 1669[2] and his consistently bitter anti-Romanism, bearing in mind also the hostility of both Anglicans and Protestant Dissenters to the claims of Rome, it is not surprising that the Declaration had very few blessings for the Papists of the land; in fact, Papists under the new dispensation were exactly in the same position as Papists and other Dissenters were before it,[3] with the exception that they enjoyed the common indulgence from the execution of the penal laws. No public places of worship were allowed them; they could exercise their particular devotions in private houses only; and there is no proof that this private worship could be attended by more than four persons over the age of 16 in addition to the household (as was allowed by clause iii of the first Conventicle Act, and clause i of the second[4]). These facts are cogent correctives to that band of writers who insist that the Indulgence arose *solely* from the Romanist sympathies of the King and the conclave at Dover. The situation was far too complicated for such one-eyed conclusions. To Roman Catholics the real importance of the document lay in its possible leverage for future policy.

For other Dissenters, sec. 2 not only gave complete

1 *S.P. 320*, 3. It is not too clear from the context whom he means by ' they.'
2 In those proposals he expressly excepted from indulgence both Roman Catholics and Fifth Monarchy men (A. A. Seaton, p. 149).
3 For a discussion of this point, see *O.R.*, iii, 156-157.
4 *Docts. Act Unif.*, pp. 478, 491.

freedom from the incidence of the penal code,[1] but also ordered the unqualified countenance of the civil powers for such freedom. Sheriffs who a few weeks before might be breaking up conventicles at point of pike were a few weeks hence 'charged and required' to protect licenced meetings from tumult and disturbance. It is true that such indulged places were to be open and free to all persons, but such a proviso is also to be found in clause v of the Toleration Act of 1689, which declares that nonconformist meetings were to receive no benefit of law if the doors were locked, barred or bolted during any time of such meetings.[2]

Sec. 3 makes it abundantly clear that the King was to be deemed the sole fount of these blessings. No new legal status was expressly conferred; licences had to be applied for 'as they shall be desired'; then the authorities treated all on their merits, due regard being had to the number appropriate to a particular district or a particular congregation, to the character and antecedents of the applicant, and to the particular building proposed as a place of assembly. The prevailing attitude was affirmative rather than negative. Cantankerous objection was hostile to the nature of the ease-loving Arlington. As to the accommodating interests of the monarch, things had come to a pretty pass when he was rushed to sign licences on the eve of departing to Portsmouth to review the ships of his friend Louis XIV early in May 1672.[3] An old Presbyterian minister, ejected from a Wiltshire living and doubly interesting to us because he was born in Wales,[4] was waiting at that town to give his application to Charles in person.[5] This was taking a rather undue advantage of the words of sec. 5 that 'allowance and approbation' were not to be made difficult to obtain.

(ii) Arlington and His Clerks.

Under the circumstances the Indulgence must be pronounced a generous, if peculiar, concession to the cause of religious liberty. But the Declaration of the 15th March only furnished in bare

1 For an interesting example of the judges 'taking notice' of the suspension of the penal laws, see the decision in the King's Bench over *The Bishop of Exeter v. Starr* (Easter Term, 1672—*Reports 2 Levinz*, 36).

2 *Docts. Act Unif.*, p. 510.

3 *O.R.*, iii, 613; *S.P. 320*, 297.

4 Calamy: *Acct.* (1713), ii, 871. His name was Henry Dent.

5 *S.P. 321*, 303. It is just possible that the words of the MS. mean that the application was presented in London after the King had gone, and that by a licence agent and not by Dent himself.

outline the proposals of the King. It was a mere framework. In actual working it had to depend upon the Earl of Arlington, the urbane hedonist who decorously wore a black patch over a nose deeply indented in the service of the elder Charles, a man who in his careless way was yet so profoundly conversant with the outlook of both Papist and Presbyterian; upon his long-headed chief secretary Sir Joseph Williamson, who had filled the same post under Arlington's predecessor Nicholas and was to follow Arlington himself as Secretary of State in 1674, director also of the activities of Butler, Blood and Innes in the months just before the Indulgence; upon *his* chief clerk Francis Benson, whose script has to be understood by all those who wish to decipher the licences recorded in the *Entry Book* 38A; and upon a number of other minor clerks, some of whom made a sad mess of the sectarian terminology used on the application forms.

It has been already mentioned that the Papist Clifford at the Treasury occasionally helped Nonconformists through his steward, Lauderdale through his secretary; in the scramble for licences the gay Buckingham does not seem to have in any way interested himself, nor the Shaftesbury who had been so prominent when the Declaration was issued, and who was in later years to do great things for civil and religious freedom—an attitude that still remains a mysterious problem. This only served to emphasise the position of Arlington. Thus licences to benefit Protestant Dissenters were mostly signed at the foot by a quasi-Papist who died an avowed Catholic, while the immense clerical work fell to the direction of Williamson, a lover of music and a secular Churchman who nevertheless (in his diary under 7 March, 1672-1673) condescended to call the Declaration an instrument for 'Liberty of Conscience.'[1] He very evidently regretted that its seal was broken on that day by the dexterous opportunist who went by the title of King of England.

In one respect the heading of this section does a serious injustice. For in addition to these unadulterated English officials of the Cabal there was one good Welshman, the Sir John Trevor of Trefalun and Plas Têg, who became member of the Privy Council as a result of the fall of Clarendon,

1 *C.R.*, iii, 604.

and was made one of the Secretaries of State in 1669. His wife was daughter to John Hampden.[1] He had had considerable experience as administrator both under the Republic and after the Restoration, and cherished in a moderate form much of the Puritan sympathies which had made his father a Welsh Commissioner for the Propagation and a Councillor of State in the days of the Rump: we have the word of Williamson that Trevor 'was theirs' (that is, in favour of concessions to nonconformists) before Clarendon was cast out. Sir John was present in his capacity as Secretary at the final council which gave its adhesion to the King's scheme of Indulgence.[2] Indeed, was it not at Plas Têg itself that William Jones, ejected from the rectory of Denbigh in 1660 and from that town under the Five Mile Act, received a pleasant asylum, besides a grant of land valued at £20 per annum?[3] Does not Jones' licence in 1672 read thus—'licence to W^{m}: Jones to be a Congr Teacher at his house att Plosteake in Denbysh. Octo^{r} 28th,' probably at an outlying house that went with the aforesaid grant of land?[4] Thus we have a King secretly Papist keeping as one of his Secretaries of State a lukewarm Anglican who openly gave shelter to a nonconformist minister.

It is easy to assess the influence of Sir John Trevor too highly. In deference to the Secretary's known Presbyterian bias, says Mr. J. G. Muddiman, even the sharp-tongued Cavalier who then acted as licenser of the Press (Sir Roger l'Estrange) saw well to excise from John Milton's *History of Britain* published in 1671 certain passages which told too harshly against the Presbyterians of the Long Parliament and the Assembly of Divines.[5] That book, by the way, was not published in 1671, but in the Michaelmas term of 1670, a fact which considerably diminishes the force of Mr. Muddiman's argument.[6] More than that, such competent critics as David Masson and Sir Leslie Stephen have serious doubts about the authenticity of these excisions, which were given to the world for the first time in 1681, and then printed by a Court publisher as "very seasonable for these times."

1 *D.N.B.*, lvii, 222.
2 Bate, pp. 79-80; *O.R.*, iii, 159.
3 Calamy: *Acct.* (1713), ii, 713; *Noncon. Mem.*, iii, 477.
4 *E.B.*, p. 261. Plas Teg happens to be in *Flintshire.*
5 *The King's Journalist* (1923), p. 40, n. 1.
6 Edward Arber: *Term Catalogues*, i, 56.

Masson scouts the idea of Sir Roger's leaving out of a book any aspersions upon the Presbyterian character,[1] thereby forgetting that one of Sir Roger's immediate superiors had strong Presbyterian leanings. Mr. Muddiman associates the licenser's attitude with the Indulgence that was then in contemplation. It has yet to be proved the Indulgence was in active contemplation by the King's ministers as early as 1670. Let us remind Mr. Muddiman that when Milton's work was licensed on 22 November in that year the Commons were busy forging the links of a third Conventicle Act.[2]

To proceed with the part played by Secretary Trevor when the Indulgence began to operate. It was one of his duties to keep in his custody *Entry Book No. 27*, which recorded the appointments arising from the King's patronage in ecclesiastical affairs ; in this book the Secretary saw well to enter 50 Indulgence licences side by side with gifts of certain canonries and prebends—treating them all indiscriminately as lying within the King's direct power. Queerly enough, not a single licence for *Wales* figures among these 50, not even that to William Jones ; in fact, the Secretary died on 28 May, 1672, exactly five months before the date of his protégé's licence. Thus for a period extending from April 2 to May 17 (the last licence recorded in *E. B.* 27) Trevor and Arlington were signing these documents concurrently. After that date, Arlington's pen was kept unwontedly busy.

(iii) Licences Particular.

Prior to the first signature on 2 April, the proper licence-forms had to be drafted and put to print, forms that would run congruent with the King's Declaration. There is plenty of evidence in *S. P. 320* that during the last fortnight in March interested persons were carefully calculating the area of the Declaration, while Arlington and his chief secretary were hard put to it in arriving at a safe mean between the maximum connoted by the King and the maximum desired by the Dissenters (men described by a Welsh bishop of the day as content with nothing but governing, by a great Anglican statesman as those who pleaded for conscience to obtain power[3]).

1 *Life of John Milton*, vi, 810.
2 *Supra*, p. 52.
3 Dr. Wm. Lucy of St. David's in a letter to Archbp. Sheldon, 20 Feb., 1672-1673 (*Tanner MS.* 146, f. 113) ; the Earl of Halifax's 'Maxims of State' (xxiii-xxvi) quoted by John Pollock: *The Popish Plot*, p. 44.

The most important form, because by far the more numerous applied for and granted, was *the licence for a particular person to preach in a particular place.* Disregarding the opening salutation and the exact date of issue at the foot, such a document ran officially as follows :—

> "*We do hereby permit and license* [name of person] *to be a Teacher of the Congregation allowed by Us in* [name of place] *for the Use of such as do not conform to the Church of England, who are of the Perswasion commonly called* [Presbyt. or Cong. or Anab.]. *With further license and permission to him the said* [name of person] *to teach in any other place licensed and allowed by US according to Our said Declaration.*"[1]

This licence was of little use unless a complementary licence for the particular 'place' was issued about the same time, a licence that read thus :—

> "*We have allowed, and We do hereby allow of* [name of place] *to be a place for the Use of such as do not conform to the Church of England, who are of the Perswasion commonly called* [Presbyt. or Cong. or Anab.] *to meet and assemble in, in order to their publick Worship and Devotion,*"

winding up with an adjuration to the King's officers to give such a place of meeting their protection from all tumult and disturbance.

The correspondence of Thomas Gilson of Brentwood brings out very clearly that a house licence without a teaching licence signified nothing[2]; the anxiety of Thomas Smith of Ruardean in Gloucester about getting a licence for a 'place' (though it was only an out-house of Thomas Bradley's) shows how well the necessary lesson of duality had been learnt.[3] It has to be admitted that several licences for 'teachers' in Wales do not boast the double entry, with the result that there is no absolute certainty they were ever issued, or if issued, of any efficacy. In a footnote in his third volume Lyon Turner has suggested the interesting possibility of a meeting being held in the house of a licenced preacher (but who had no separate licence for that house), he himself

1 Specimens of this licence-form can be examined in *S.P. 320*, 7 (blank spaces), in the licence of William Jenkyn to Aldersgate Street (the first issued, *E.B.*, p. 1), and in that of Samuel Ogden at Little Ireton in Derby (copied into Calamy's *Continuation*, i, 234).

2 *S.P. 321*, 170.

3 *O.R.*, iii, 540-541.

present to produce his own personal licence but not preaching, and says that the local Anglican authorities might make trouble.[1] The Professor surely implies (but does not say so) that some other preacher *was* preaching: would not the aforesaid authorities be equally ready to take action if the Minister first referred to was *himself* holding forth? Some pages lower down he very rightly brings up many cases where in town or village several houses were licenced, but in which locality there is no record of a licence having been issued to a 'teacher'; he then concludes that the services in these meeting-places would have to be conducted by neighbours or itinerants.[2] Unfortunately for this argument, no neighbours could do so unless they were licenced, and no itinerants dare do so unless they were 'general' teachers. On the very next page after this, when comparing the numbers of licenced ministers and licenced meeting-places, and finding that in no county were Congregational teachers in excess of Congregational houses to be supplied, he makes the statement that there ensued a competition among the latter for the services of the former. Surely not, unless the teachers were all 'general.' One problem the learned Professor did not at all address his mind unto: if the houses of John Phillips and Mark Gibbon at Uzmaston in Pembroke were licenced as Presbyterian meeting-places and only two teachers licenced in the whole county (not one of them Presbyterian, not one of them 'general'), then who was to preach at those particular houses? At present it must remain an anomaly.[3] So must the fact that five Congregational meeting-places in Denbighshire had no definite teachers associated with them: would Richard Jones, the 'general' teacher living at Ruabon, be expected to roam to Abergele and Ruthin and to the unascertained 'Wimblimglym' where a certain David Thomas had his home?

In reality the strictures in the preceding paragraph on the Professor's outlook arise from a profound disagreement with him over a point truly fundamental, over the exact meaning to be read into the addendum of the particular

1 p. 714.
2 p. 737.
3 'Five houses are licenced in Lincoln for Anabaptists, but no preacher named: *pray let me know who are licenced for those five.*' Thus the Bishop of Lincoln on 7 Sept. to Williamson (*C.S.P.*, 1672, p. 589). Unfortunately, the Secretary's answer is not on record.

licence—' with further licence and permission to him the said [particular teacher] to teach *in any other place* licenced and allowed by Us.' In other words, it is here held that the whole document must be viewed as one organic entity, the addendum read closely in the light of the main licence. The allowed minister had one congregation, and one house was licenced him for preaching ; should the King and his officers see wise to permit more preaching-places for that particular congregation, then the aforesaid minister could extend his services to them. Cogency is given to this construction by the restrictory words at the end of sec. 4 of the Declaration : ' our express will and pleasure is, that none of our subjects presume to meet in any place until such places be allowed, *and the teacher of that congregation be approved by Us.*' Do not these words mean that all meeting-places were complementary to congregations ? Do not the words signify further that teachers (that is, particular preachers) were complementary to congregations and not supplementary to them ? And if it be found that a ' particular ' licencee applies for further meeting-places, some of them lying very far afield, that need occasion no surprise when we remember that a church adherent of Llanwenarth (west of Abergavenny) lived as far distant as Llanigon in Brecon,[1] and that the Baptist congregation of Rhydwilym enrolled members from Dihewid in Cardigan to Slebech in Pembroke. Were not those who ' joyned and covenanted together ' to choose Robert Thomas of Baglan as pastor on 28 March, 1666, drawn from places as far distant as Newton Nottage in the east and ' up and down ' in Llangyfelach in the west ?[2] If Vavasor Powell could point to gathered churches some of which numbered 500 communicants,[3] then it was possible (but not very probable) for their licenced pastors in 1672 to ask for licenced houses up to a dozen each. It is not extravagant to assert that the wide geographical range of the single gathered church is one of the strongest reasons for applying a restricted sense to the ' further licence . . to teach *in any other place* ' of the addendum. Thus we arrive at a surprising phenomenon in the history of the licences—that the supervision of the

1 Joshua Thomas : *Hanes y Bedyddwyr*, p. 153, n.†.
2 *Trans. Bapt. Hist. Soc. of Wales* (1916-1919), pp. 55-56.
3 *Bird in the Cage Chirping* (1661), p. 8.

gathered church depended, not upon the operation of the 'general' licence, but upon the multiplicity of particular ones.

Samuel Jones of Llangynwyd received a licence for his own house to preach in. Like every other similar licencee, his licence contained the addendum aforesaid. This addendum would only entitle him to preach at any places specially licenced for him and his widely-scattered congregation (as a matter of fact, he secured three, if not four, in addition); Lyon Turner holds over and over again that such an addendum gave Jones the right of entry to any place licenced for his particular 'perswasion,' not only in mid-Glamorgan, but in the whole country.[1] One must hasten to say that a sentence in an explanatory letter sent by Dr. Nicholas Butler on 4 April to a dissenter in the country, a sentence written by a gentleman thoroughly steeped in the exact terminology of the early licences and at a juncture of time when its true import had not been obscured, seems to bear out the contention of Turner—'the places must be mentioned and so licensed, the name of the minister and his Perswasion, and so he wid (= would) not only be licensed to this place, but to all places whatsoever we have licensed.'[2] Even in the face of the London doctor's high authority, such an interpretation is a manifest absurdity. It makes a particular licence co-terminous with a general one.

The generalising of the addendum has some stubborn facts and awkward situations to get over. If two preachers in Birmingham made application for six places each, narrowed them down in a second application to three each, and finally only received three meeting-places between them, it is safe to conclude the authorities thought that number sufficient for their particular followers.[3] They were unlikely to give them free entry to any more licenced houses by the backstairs of any addendum. Incidentally, the Birmingham licences, as well as those of the Llangynwyd area, prove Turner's remark to be only relatively true when he says that only two licences (one for the teacher, one for the place) were needed for any single congregation.[4] It is very evident Samuel Willis

1 *O.R.*, iii, 516, 574, 597, 697, 701-702, 779. Yet in iii, 536, in discussing the application made for John Corbet of Bramshot, he draws a distinction between *special* and *general* licences to the *disadvantage* of the former.
2 *ib.*, 205-206.
3 *S.P. 320*, 259, 260; *E.B.*, pp. 59, 206, 207.
4 *O.R.*, iii, 739.

and William Fincher of Birmingham thought otherwise. Did not Samuel Hieron also, of Chartham in Kent, put in an application for four separate houses in that quarter on 3 May, and find them all issued five days later ?[1] And as for Daniel Higgs, the Swansea Independent, it is capable of proof that he once hoped to preach to members of his congregation in seven different places, with Swansea itself as a convenient centre. He succeeded in obtaining four, and the argument here is that in those four places, and in no others, did his licences allow him to preach. Since the Independent Hugh Owen of Bronyclydwr in Merioneth was granted a particular licence with the same addendum, remembering in addition that four place-licences came to that county all marked 'Congregational,' might we not confidently deduce that these were some of the five or six places he used to visit in that county to keep up the hearts of his gathered church of Independents ?[2] The same theory fits well with James Davies of Cardigan being licenced to preach there as well as at Cenarth across Teify.

To view the problem from another angle. There is the testimony of Dr. William Lucy, Bishop of St. David's, to whom the whole Indulgence was anathema, but who for that very reason was thoroughly versed in its exact connotation. In reporting to his metropolitan the activities of Stephen Hughes he falls into error over the particular documents Stephen held from the King. He knows, however, they were only for two places ; and 'onely' in those two places (the Bishop is careful to point out) was the great Puritan supposed to minister. If a nonconformist licencee moved down at the end of 1672 from the Salop border to the diocese of St. David's, would not the addendum to his personal licence entitle him to preach in all the licenced meeting-places of his new sphere ? No, said Bishop Lucy, '*as I can learne*, [he] *has noe license*,' no licence (that is) to preach outside the Salop congregation allowed him by the Indulgence officials.[3] Common sense is on the side of the Bishop. For it would be interesting to know, if personal or particular licences had so wide an application as Lyon Turner and

1 *S.P. 320*, 298 ; *E.B.*, p. 87.
2 *Noncon. Mem.*, iii, 491.
3 For these two cases, see the Bishop's letter to Archbishop Sheldon (*Tanner MS.* 146, ff. 138-138v).

Nicholas Butler would lead us to believe, what advantage lay in having 'general' licences at all. The distinction between the two classes would be insignificant. Why should Joshua Lloyd of Monmouthshire ask for permission to be an 'Itinerant if possible,'[1] if a personal licence would give full outlet for his instincts as an evangelist?

Again, what accounts for the Whitehall officials conceding no less than ten Anabaptist 'generals' for the county of Cambridge[2] if we assume that ten special licences would serve an equally good purpose? A Worcester minister named Richard Moore applied for a general licence "to preach in lawful places."[3] For some reasons the authorities only allowed him to preach in his own house 'and *noe other place*'[4] (p. 44 of the *Entry Book* 38A testifies that his licence was a personal one with the usual addendum to preach in any other place licenced). Next, let us note that when the Declaration was cancelled in 1673, one preacher in London at once received a warrant to appear before the magistrates, while another at Norwich was forced out of his meeting-house. These peremptory actions become more intelligible when it is found that the first had only a particular licence to preach in his own house at Tettenhall in Staffs.,[5] and the second a similarly-worded licence for his own house at Mansfield in Notts.[6] No mercy could be expected by men who had so overstepped the bounds of the Declaration. Besides, one of them boasted the inauspicious surname of *Cromwell*.

Finally, corroborating evidence comes from other happenings in 1673-1674, at a time when the licences were not called in (though the Declaration was cancelled). Impetuous Cavalier magistrates put the conventicle laws in motion, notwithstanding the discouraging orders of King and Council. Of the 'particular' preachers who were fined at that period, *all to a man were either caught preaching at houses for which they were not particularly licenced* or *in houses which had no licences at all.*[7] In the case of Thomas Gates of Ellington

1 *S.P. 321*, 353.
2 *E.B.*, p. 123 (on 16 May).
3 *S.P. 320*, 172.
4 It should be made clear that these emphatic words do not appear in *E.B. 38A*, but in the somewhat carelessly compiled Index of *E.B. 38B*. It is the *only* entry of this type in that Index.
5 Cp. Calamy: *Contin.*, ii, 777, with *E.B.*, p. 249.
6 Cp. Calamy: *Account* (1713) ii, 527, with *E.B.*, p. 180.
7 This statement rests on a collation of the *Calendar of Treasury Books*, iv., 1672-5 (in which the names of the indiscreet conventiclers are found) with the entries in the Indulgence records.

in Hunts. one is surprised to find him punished for preaching at his own house (for which he could show the King's licence), until we hear he went to preach at a widow's house in Godmanchester, which had been licenced for quite a different preacher.[1]

Let us sum up our arguments in this section by saying that the addendum to a particular licence ought in effect to read as under :—

> "*With further licence and permission to him the said* [person] *to teach in any other place licenced and allowed* [for that congregation] *by Us according to OUR said Declaration.*"

We have no doubt that Arlington and his officials meant it in that sense.[2]

(iv) Licences General.

This type of licence (of which Baxter's is the most famous) represented the high-water mark of the Indulgence wave. Out of a total of about 1,607 teaching licences granted, only 236 can be definitely described as 'general.' In form they read thus :—

> "*We do hereby permit and licence* [name of person] *of the Perswasion commonly called* [Presbyt. or Cong. or Anab.] *to be a Teacher, and to teach in any Place licenced and allowed by US.*"[3]

There are good grounds for thinking that these licences were at first meant to meet the case of nonconformists 'without a people,'[4] that is to say, ministers who were ejected from their livings in 1660-1662, who were forced to leave their old habitations by the Five Mile Act, and who had since lived quietly under the two Conventicle enactments. Ministers who had lost touch with their former congregations and had not gathered new ones. That distinction was no sooner defined than forgotten : among the first general licences issued was one to John Hickes,[5] the imperturbable hero who used to preach to a congregation on the no-man's land

1 *E.B.*, p. 122.

2 The strongest argument *against* such a view is the work of Bunyan in October, 1672, taking his 'particular' licence as far afield as Leicester, and calmly showing it to the Mayor and Justices, *who seem not to have entered the slightest protest against his procedure* (*Trans. Bapt. Hist. Soc.*, vi, 129-137). But this might be explained by the general laxity of the time or by the particular indulgence of the Leicester authorities. The latest edition of Dr. Brown's *Life* of Bunyan, ed. by F. Mott Harrison (1928), contains nothing new on this particular point (see pp. 217, 234. 235).

3 *S.P. 320*, 10.

4 *ib.* 4 (Dr. Butler to Williamson, 23 March, 1671-1672) ; see also *O.R.*, iii, 198, 247.

5 *E.B.*, p. 8 (it was one of the licences issued on the first day).

of the Salt Stone rock in Devon,[1] and to John Musgrave of Taunton who, after making application for a licence 'to preach in any place allowed by his Ma^tie,' changed his mind, and preferred to preach to a definite congregation at Nether Stowey.[2] And how could four Canterbury men who each received a general licence on 29 May be said 'not to have a people' when the records of the Restoration prove them to have been living in the town for years and citizens of substance there ?[3] And although these licences were generous in their terms, the records contain some very curious entries concerning them. It did not of necessity follow that they were always preferred to the more restricted personal licences. Up in Northumberland there were at least five cases where these 'general' forms were given as consolation prizes to those who had been disappointed in getting access to town halls or parochial chapels. There were many more examples of ministers who complemented such licences with particular licences for their own houses or for those of neighbours; and there is one interesting document which proves (in the case of the 'younger' or second Edmund Calamy) that the 'general' licence obtained was only a safety makeshift until a definite meeting-place had been decided upon by his congregation, when the general would be at once narrowed down into a particular.[4] On the other hand, there is a case in Devon of a minister securing *two* general licences.[5] According to the words of the *Entry Book*, there is absolute certainty that Dr. Henry Cornish, who once held a Canonry of Christ Church under the Puritan powers at Oxford, succeeded in getting no less than *three*.[6] Naturally, many applicants for the wider indulgence had to be content with the narrower. In what category are we to place those two Independents of London who had a joint particular licence to preach at the garden of one of them in Cherry Tree Alley on Bunhill,[7] and two other Independents who each had permission to hold services at the house of John Savage on London Bridge ?[8] There is one instance of a personal licence

1 *O.R.*, iii, 588-589.
2 *S.P. 321*, 14, 67; *E.B.*, p. 97; position discussed in *O.R.*, iii, 453.
3 *O.R.*, iii, 464-466.
4 Cp. *S.P. 320*, 34; *E.B.*, pp. 5, 9.
5 *E.B.*, pp. 76, 249 (Francis Sourton of Powderham).
6 *ib.*, pp. 31, 191, 228.
7 *ib.*, p. 22.
8 *ib.*, p. 32.

in *E. B* 38A being incorrectly magnified in the Index of *E. B.* 38B into that for 'a teacher at large'[1]; and in the summaries of Professor Lyon Turner one is described as a 'general teacher' who was nothing of the kind, and he no less than the very first minister who was licenced under the Declaration.[2] Only a particularly obsessed statistician would attempt to shepherd these anomalies into the bounds of a classified list. Circumstances have always altered cases. Never more so, to all appearance, than in the days of the Earl of Arlington.

At first even the official expert at Whitehall was caught napping over the precise significance of these particular documents. On 2 April a John Milward of Somerset was allowed a 'general' licence[3]; on the 30th Dr. Nicholas Butler made application for the house of George Milward at Farincomb for Mr. John Milward 'whoe already hath a licence in generall,' a perfectly natural desire on the part of the latter to extend his licenced area[4]; but Francis Benson on 2 May drew out a 'particular' licence for John to teach at the house of George, thus arming the former with two distinctly separate licences and a new 'place' to boot.[5] The *locus classicus* on the subject is Butler's application on 9 May that the house of a Mr. Harris at Margaretting in Essex should be licenced—'Elias Pledger is to bee teacher, but hath already a generall licence, *soe needs noe more.*'[6] He thus saved the officials from the mistake of doing in Pledger's case what they had done a week before in John Milward's. From their very nature, general licences were not local, a truism which ought to have prevented Lyon Turner from referring to Richard Saunders of Devon as 'a general teacher *for Honiton.*'[7] It may also serve to remind those who read p. 266 of the *Entry Book* that David Jones was a Congregational 'general' teacher '*of* Pencarreg' in Carmarthenshire, and not '*at* Pencarreg.'

Except in the six or seven cases where the documents specifically allowed Presbyterians and Congregationalists to

1 *E.B.*, cp. marginal note on p. 3 with the last entry on p. 4 (case of William Sims of Kingston in Surrey, who had only a particular licence for a specified house).
2 *ib.*, cp. p. 2 with *O.R.*, ii, 971.
3 *ib.*, p. 4.
4 *S.P. 320*, 210.
5 *E.B.*, p. 67.
6 *S.P. 321*, 65.
7 Cp. *O.R.*, iii, 561, with the wording of *E.B.*, p. 12.

worship under the same roof, permission was not given, either to general or to particular licencees, to go outside the precise 'perswasion' entered on the record. Neither the King nor his Council went so far as to aid and abet comprehension or reunion in the Puritan ranks. Yet it is difficult to believe that the Presbyterian Philip Henry was not preaching to Independents at Marton in Salop on 24 June, 1672,[1] a district where the only licence granted belonged to that sect.[2] The one obstacle to this conclusion is Henry's deep-seated antipathy to the Congregational system.

1 *Diaries*, p. 253.
2 Granted on 22 May to Wm. Phipps at the house of James Dod (*E.B.*, p 134). [For more on this point, see *infra*, pp. 124-125.]

X.

INTERPRETATION—CONTINUED.

(v) Whitehall's Goodwill.

No discrimination seems to have been made between the doctrinal partialities of the applicants. No questions were asked as to whether they had ever been ordained ministers. Richard Coore of Tonge in Yorkshire deliberately described himself as an Antinomian, and obtained a licence to that effect[1]; and in 1672 a licence was given to William Milman of Llangwm in Monmouth notwithstanding an informer's description in 1669 that he was a Sabbatarian Anabaptist.[2] Both Richard Baxter and Francis Bampfield secured permission to teach in any licenced place, the sectarian delimitation in neither case going farther than 'a Nonconforming minister'[3]: in the first case it was probably an indirect tribute to his well-known comprehensionist principles, in Bampfield's it marks the development of a whilom Presbyterian into a Seventh Day Baptist (in fact, he published a book in defence of his new beliefs in the Indulgence year[4]).

The officials at Whitehall seem to have accepted the generous spirit of sec. 2 of the Declaration with exceeding heartiness, and even to have improved upon it. While the words of that section only laid an interdict upon the *present* execution of all penal laws against nonconformists, it must have been an unwritten regulation with Arlington and Williamson that a record of past sins in this respect was not to affect the issuing of a licence. Else why should Bishop Lucy in a letter to Sheldon and the archdeacon of Brecon in a letter to Williamson both wax indignant over excommunicate Dissenters receiving licences in the counties of Carmarthen, Brecknock and Radnor ?[5] And months after the archdeacon

1 *S.P. 321*, 199; *E.B.*, p. 141.
2 *E.B.*, p. 220; *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 186b.
3 *E.B.*, pp. 190 (Bampfield), 272 (Baxter).
4 Calamy: *Acct.* (1713), ii, 258-261.
5 *Tanner MS.* 146, ff. 138-138v (Lucy's letter); *S.P. Dom., Chas. II, 312*, No. 1 (archdeacon's letter, dated 24 June, 1672).

wrote his letter, a group of licences was granted to men at Beguildy and Glasgwm in Radnor who, if they were not Fifth Monarchists themselves, were very intimate with the counsels of Vavasor Powell at a time when he was making mighty efforts to upset the Protectorate of Cromwell in the interests of the Fifth Monarch. Of course, if such men overstepped the bounds of prudence in their preaching, the authorities could proceed against them with the 'all imaginable severity' of sec. 6.

Very extreme men undoubtedly secured licences to preach. But other extremists (more conscientious men, possibly) never made a move in the matter. For them there still remained the attenuated privileges sanctioned by the two Conventicle Acts of preaching to four persons over and besides those of their own household, or to three persons over and besides those of any other household, or to three persons in a house, field or place where there was no family inhabiting.[1] It will be found later that many of these unlicenced extremists preached from 1672 to 1675 just as if they had a licence. For them also sec. 6 of the Declaration promised 'all imaginable severity.' During the period of the Indulgence the noise of that thunder rolled innnocently away in the far distance.

The fact that no less than 78 licences (counting those for teachers and places separately) were given out on 2 April, the first day of issue,[2] seems to support an inspired remark of Dr. Nicholas Butler's that it was at one time contemplated to name a maximum limit of time beyond which 'noe Nonconformist shall dare to preach . . . without licence.'[3] That point of longitude (to use the Doctor's metaphor) was never found. Licences were issued right up to the eve of the opening of Parliament on 4 February, 1672-1673. Arlington was as willing to sign licences at the eleventh hour as on the first. Williamson seemed genuinely sorry that his own part in the Indulgence was over.

1 This third possibility is implied in the first clause of the second Conventicle Act (*Docts. Act Unif.*, pp. 491-492).
2 *E.B.*, pp. 2-9.
3 *S.P. Dom., Chas. II, 304*, 47.

(vi) Some Checks and Disappointments.

It is no wonder that the name of Dr. Butler can not be kept out from many paragraphs in this chapter. After the Indulgence was declared on the 15 March, he was even more ubiquitously active than before, always exerting pressure on the side of greater liberty for Dissenters, and ever ready with such suggestions to 'help the latitude' as would, if adopted, bid fair to stretch the four corners of the Declaration to breaking-point. Yet it must be repeated that the Doctor was no Dissenter, but a typical Restoration materialist, an admitted bigamist, a lip-server of the Church of England, and quite ready to turn Papist should circumstances warrant such a turning of one's coat.[1] In 1672, for all these facts, he was the real father of the 'general' licence; to him also was due the seemingly ambitious addendum to the personal licences; he took pains in 'spreading his majesties pleasure amoung the severall perswasions,'[2]; he wrote letters to Dissenters in the country in explanation of the licence forms; he also organised addresses of thanks from nonconformists to the King.[3] The Declaration was hardly four days old before Butler was submitting to Williamson seven points upon the administration of the Indulgence, and four days after that was ready with three reasons to corroborate one of the seven, 'which I think when I tell them will seeme good.'[4] In one letter he goes further and suggests the propriety of the King's supplementing the Indulgence of March by removing all the civil and political disabilities of nonconformists.[5] Mindful of the serried ranks of Parliamentary Cavaliers enjoying an angry holiday in the country, that official did not deign to take notice of the Doctor's cryptic reference to 'civills.'

Nor did Arlington's chief secretary take kindly to a scheme of Butler's for licensing houses upon 'extraordinary family occations, [for example,] to keepe a day of fast or thanksgiving in a private family with a moderate number.'[6] Professor Lyon Turner thinks this to mean that nonconformist services

1 *O.R.*, iii, 175-180.
2 *S.P. 320*, 4.
3 *ib.*, 5 (27 March), 6 (29 March).
4 Cp. *S.P. 304*, 47. with *320*, 4. It is in the former that he uses the term 'to help the latitude.'
5 *S.P. 320*, 33 (to Williamson, 4 April, 1672).
6 *ib.*, 5 (letter dated 27 March).

might be held at baptisms, weddings and funerals, for prayer and worship, with closed doors ; Alexander Gordon sees in it licences *ad hoc* for certain specified occasions, though neither teacher nor place was otherwise licenced.[1] But surely this would be playing fast and loose with sec. 3 of the Declaration, which dogmatically put it that all (personal) licences were to be attached to specially defined places, whose doors were always to be open. Lyon Turner goes so far as to suggest also that it might be an astute device to benefit the Papists, for under cover of this practice the latter could assemble ' a moderate number ' and thus counterbalance the Dissenters' privileges to have public meetings.[2] Butler certainly not being a Papist at this time, the ground for this argument gives way. There is not a tittle of evidence that these excrescent liberties were allowed by the authorities. Butler's generally generous attitude cannot be better summarised than in the words he wrote to Arlington on 29 March : ' there is noe thing can bind them [Dissenters] in Loyalty more to his Majesty than to let their Licences bee large and free from intanglements . . . a little love obligeth more than great severity.'[3] Wise words, assuredly.

And what nonconformist would not give warm thanks to this Butler for the strong appeals he penned on 26 April to both Arlington and Williamson that licenced Dissenters should have the use as meeting-places of town halls, unendowed chapels and discarded school-houses ?[4] He says, but inaccurately, that licencees at present obtain no more freedom than what members of the Romish persuasion freely enjoy, forgetting that sec. 5 unequivocally stated that Papists were only to have unlicenced and restricted services in private assemblies. Butler declares the Indulgence is ' stiffled in y^{e} birth ' by the refusal to licence halls and similar public buildings : the Dissenters, he humorously points out, will conclude from the refusal that where God hath his church the Devil must have his chapel, it being the Evil One's great ambition to keep the Gospel from being preached (probably the Doctor would be rather shocked to know that in August Philip Henry was to write that wheat in a barn was better

1 *O.R.*, iii, 195 and n. *.
2 *ib.*, 195, 248.
3 *S.P. 320*, 6.
4 *ib.*, 196 (Arlington), 197 (Williamson).

than chaff in a church[1]). Therefore let the conformable clergy rest satisfied with the public churches, let licenced Dissenters have the chapels : did not the Declaration itself only debar them from acceding to church benefices (sec. 5) ? This was a very subtle gloss indeed. But the men at Arlington's lodgings did not fall into the trap. Four such licences for Newcastle were drawn up on 16 April, but never approved or given out.[2] One of the few notable exceptions was the successful application (after three unsuccessful attempts[3]), of Colonel Thomas Birch for the grant of a licence for 'a private Oratory' situated on his land in Lancashire outside Manchester, probably because the Colonel could prove that before the wars it was used by his ancestors as a barn to lay in fodder for cattle (and therefore not consecrated).[4]

Coming to Wales, it is known that Daniel Higgs of Swansea failed to get a licence to preach at the school-house there[5] (probably the building once put up for the Puritan free school in the town), and that John Powell was unsuccessful in his application for the use of the market house at Newport in Monmouth.[6] On the other hand, the Bell Inn at Caerwent, then in the occupation of John Morris, *was* licenced,[7] and so also was a large room over the market at Oswestry, notwithstanding that the words of the application described it as 'an House in Oswalstree in Sh—sheire.'[8] A licence came too to a room or rooms at the Shrewsbury King's Head, as a meeting-place for James Quarrell, Vavasor's old friend and apologist ?[9] It is curious that only three applications for the use of inns were made throughout the country, that each was successful, and that two were situated either in Wales or on the immediate Border. The house of Edward Kenrick licenced as a 'place' for the Congregationalists of Wrexham had the rather suspicious name of 'the Talbot,' but the local historian does not in any way suggest it was an inn.[10] It is not at all easy to explain how the house of Thomas Williams

1 *Diaries*, p. 255.
2 *E.B.*, pp. 23-24.
3 *S.P. 320*, 38, 155, 225.
4 *ib.*, 155 I; *E.B.*, p. 51 (record of licence).
5 *ib.*, 84, 86, 88.
6 *S.P. 321*, 353.
7 *E.B.*, p. 166.
8 *ib.*, p 218; cp. *S.P. 321*, 237.
9 *ib.*, p. 134.
10 A. N. Palmer: *Hist. Older Nonconformity of Wrexham*, pp. 47-48. The truth really is that Kenrick had two houses in Wrexham, and that there is no real certainty which of the two held the licence.

at Swansea was not allowed for Daniel Higgs to preach in, unless he was the same Thomas Williams who had once been ensign in the Parliamentary army, and in 1651-1652 responsible for repairs to the Puritan school at that centre.[1] Even if they were one and the same, there are plenty of instances of men in receipt of licences who had held much higher commands under Cromwell than mere ensigns. Is it not much more probable that the high authorities thought the personality of Thomas Williams satisfactory enough, but opined that a preacher who could already show four place-licences, and those all granted within the space of four days in April,[2] was presuming rather too much upon the King's Indulgence in asking for another ?

(vii) The Declaration and the Church Courts.

So far the discussion of the Indulgence has in the main ranged over Dissenters, of both schools. But the Snowe-Heywood incident, the powerful influences which made the Whitehall officials refuse licences to halls and chapels, the whispered missives of Dr. Butler to Williamson, with their continual emphasis on secrecy, their sometimes ciphered signatures—together supply irrefragable evidence that the dominant party in Church and Parliament viewed the new developments with watchfully hostile eyes. To them the whole Indulgence was an abomination, the confessions of its preamble the open heresy of a dangerous tactician.

There never was a charter of freedom more complete than the immunity given to nonconformists by sec. 2 from the incidence of the penal laws. But neither that section, nor any other section, gave a ruling concerning the operation of those writs, warrants and other processes by which generations of Anglican jurists had so dexterously confounded the dividing lines between the Common and the Canon Law. Apart from the words of sec. 1 that all men of whatsoever opinions were to keep on paying their tithes and dues, there were no guiding principles defining how a social and religious order set on an Anglican orientation was to sit harmoniously on the shoulders of an underworld of Papists and extreme

1 *MS. J. Walker*, c. 13, f. 23.
2 *E.B.*, pp. 26, 39.

Protestants. Vexatious questions were very soon to arise from these silences of the Declaration.[1]

Preserved among the *Tanner MSS.* at the Bodleian is a legal opinion—undated, unsigned, bearing the marks of much correction, probably the work of somebody connected with Doctors' Commons or the Court of Arches—stating the Anglican view regarding sec. 2 of the Declaration, and how far it affected the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts.[2] Did this section, asks this lawyer, mean that *all* matters and crimes of ecclesiastical cognisance were to be left unpunishable in the case of Dissenters, that all penalties relating to reformation of manners were to be challenged and contended against? Will not occasion be given by the 'generality' of section 2 to obstruct ecclesiastical judges in the exercise of their duties, and may not any frivolous fellow 'so often as he is convented for any *other* crime of ecclesiastical cognisance' call to his aid the latitude of its words? May not such a person upon all occasions be ready to suggest complaints against the officials of the church courts and the extent of their authority, 'to which under a Colour thereof [that is, of sec. 2] he may have a plausible pretence of Exception'? It is not contemplated here to follow the series of objections and answers, the learned references to *Circumspecte Agatis* and the various *Articuli* statutes, the comments thereon of Sir Edward Coke, the lines of demarcation drawn between *spiritualia* and *temporalia*, the inquiry into the possibility of the King exercising his regal power in matters ecclesiastical 'to visitt Reforme,' nor the appeal to statutes of Elizabeth and of James, and to the clause of the Act of 13 Chas. II which abolished the Court of High Commission[3]—only to quote the considered opinion of this jurist that, notwithstanding the notorious sec. 2, all church officers from the Archbishop downwards retained their former power to inflict the pains and censures of the Church upon all offenders against its laws. 'Saving alwaies that no person either nonconformist or Recusant be presented for not

1 Even where the terms of the Indulgence were most explicit, they were misunderstood by some justices in Suffolk. They thought the Dissenters could do just as they liked, only 'that the King by the last clause [sec. 6] reserved their punishment to himself.' An incredulous Anglican asks Williamson to report whether matters were quite as bad as all that (*C.S.P.*, 1672, p. 543—31 Aug.).

2 Vol. 43, ff. 195-199.

3 Technically, this Court had been abolished in 1641. The Act of 1661 (clause ii) merely said it was not to be revived.

frequenting his parish Church or receiving the Sacrament, *but that all penalties bee against them for the present as to those particular crimes and no otherwise suspended.*'[1]

Highly Anglican though the general tenor of this opinion is, magnifying as it does the sphere of the ecclesiastical courts over the secular, it cannot be said to traverse the plain equity of the situation. Moreover, it was corroborated by the insertion in the abortive bill of 1673 ('for the ease of Dissenters') of a special clause to guard against any equivocation on the subject.[2] So it may be concluded that under the Indulgence, with all the portentous dispensations granted in sec. 2, nonconformists' children had still to be baptised in the parish church; in the unlikely contingency of a Dissenter being accused of blasphemy or atheism, he had to make his appearance before the ecclesiastical courts; if certain parishioners in certain Carmarthenshire parishes tried under the shadow of the Indulgence to escape paying the usual church rates, they were very promptly 'presented' by the churchwardens[3]; if Peregrine Phillips of Haverfordwest clandestinely celebrated marriages at one or both of his two meeting-places at that town (as was charged against him by Bishop Lucy), the licences granted on 30 April would not suffice to protect him from the emissaries of that pugnacious prelate.[4] Perhaps the Baptists of Rhydwilym had not as yet begun to solemnise marriages, solemnised ostensibly without thought of entering a parish church, similar to that between Eleanor John and Lewis Philip of Llangolman in 1681.[5] It is a very moot point indeed whether the suspension of the penal laws against Dissenters would entitle their dead to be buried in consecrated ground. "Although he will slight my excommunication in the gaiety and pride of his life, yet he will find it burthensome to him at his death." Words from the letter sent by Dr. Lucy to His Grace the Archbishop on 20 February, 1672-1673.[6] This excommunication, it should

1 For a very interesting case bearing on the procedure of ecclesiastical courts in the light of sec. 2 of the Declaration, see *C.S.P.*, 1672, pp. 536-539 (*Sir Edward Lake v. Theophilus Brittain*). It arose in the diocese of Lincoln, and illustrates the difficulties that beset the Chancellor of a diocese in dealing with a dissenting minister who was under the ban of the Church when the Indulgence was declared.

2 *Tanner MS.* 43, f. 189v (first subsection in part marked A).

3 *Trans. Carm. Antiq. Soc.*, xxxviii, 61-68.

4 *E.B.*, p. 51 (Peregrine's licences); *Tanner MS. 146*, f. 138v (aspersions of the Bishop).

5 J. Spinther James: *Hanes y Bedyddwyr*, ii, 491 (n. †).

6 *Tanner MS.* 146, f. 113.

be added, refers to measures taken against a Dissenter not for unlicenced preaching under the Indulgence, but for keeping an unlicenced school against clause iv of the Five Mile Act.

This letter of Lucy's is a highly lachrymose but important document, especially because it expatiates upon the difficulties of the bishops under the terms of the Declaration. Almost all the licencees in the diocese, he proceeds to say, are excommunicated persons already—'they cannot be killed twice.' In discussing how some preach outside the scope of their licences, he believes he could snap them with the writ *de excommunicato capiendo*, since he was confident that that writ 'exceeded' the permission given them to preach (much as the Bishop of Peterborough argued in 1685 that, notwithstanding James II's pardon, those who were in prison under that writ could not be bailed till they had paid their fines[1]). Here the Bishop treads on very doubtful ground: that writ was meant to snap people for the very crimes connived at by a particular section of the Declaration; and if the terms of the Declaration had been exceeded, procedure against them would assuredly lie at common law, and not in obedience to the issue of an ecclesiastical writ. Even then the question remains how far such procedure would be valid under a mere declaration not embodied in an Act of Parliament. The jurist of the *Tanner MS.* was more cautious than the Bishop. Lucy manages at the opening of his letter to state a conundrum that the Archbishop himself would find very difficult to solve: if the parents may go to these licenced conventicles, who can be offended with their children that go with them, 'or with them that carry these children'? Both high dignitaries must have been well aware how it was possible under the two Conventicle Acts for a nonconformist preacher, so long as he did not transform his assembly into a school, to address any number of young persons *under sixteen years of age*, and the sheriff could not touch him.

Throughout the letter runs the shadow of the King's displeasure with bishops who want to snap nonconformists with writs. Lucy says he was exceeding 'cautelouse' in observing His Majesty's will. Thus he was confronted with

1 *Tanner MS.* 31, f. 19 (letter to Archbishop Sancroft, 7 April, 1685).

the dilemma of correcting the transgressions of Dissenters without offending against the Declaration. The downhearted and aged bishop did not know that the day before he sent this letter from Brecon had seen the last licence carried away from Whitehall.[1] Perhaps he was never to read that most significant remark at the very close of the jurist's opinion just quoted—'penalties . . . *for the present* . . . to be suspended.' Just a fortnight after the Brecon letter was penned the King was solemnly breaking the seal on the Declaration he had published less than a year before.

For the present, however, and for the whole year 1672-1673, penalties on Dissenters for not repairing to their parish churches were very effectively suspended, just as the learned lawyer put it. The most convincing evidence comes from the ultra-Cavalier county of Montgomery. At the September Sessions of 1671 seven Dissenters of Llanbrynmair were presented for non-attendance at church; at the Sessions of April 1673, just a few weeks after the breaking of the Declaration, eight were at once presented from three parishes; *but at the Sessions of September* 1672 *not a single Nonconformist was entered on the charge sheet.* The Grand Jurors had perforce to be satisfied with naming the names of only two men, both from the hundred of Deytheur, one for allowing drunkenness at his house on the Lord's Day, and the other for getting drunk on several Lord's Days. There was no doubt that for the nonce the King had completely paralysed the arms of the persecutors of Montgomery, even though the fierce Maurice of Penybont was one of their number.[2]

(viii) The Declaration and the Five Mile Act.

Did sec. 2 of the Declaration make the Five Mile Act nugatory and allow the ejected ministers to return to their old spheres? Of the devastation caused by clause iii of that Act in Wales alone, the following table will tell its own story

1 *S.P. 321*, 378. It was on 3 Feb., 1672-1673, that the last licences were *issued* at Whitehall. Very curiously, this particular licence, 'carried away' on 19 February, 1673, had been ready drawn up since 25 July (*O.R.*, iii, 521-522).

2 R. Williams: *Extracts from Gaol Files* (Mont. Colls., xxiv, 215-216).

Minister.	*Old Sphere of Work.*	*New Domicile.*
Davies, James ..	*Merthyr (Carm.)* ..	*Cardigan.*
Edwards, John ..	*Llangorse*	*Abergavenny.*
Evans, Thomas ..	*Maesmynus* ..	*Llanafanfawr.*
French, John	*Wenvoe*	*Cardiff.*
Henry, Philip	*Worthenbury* ..	*Broad Oak.*
Higgs, Daniel	*Porteynon*	*Swansea.*
Hughes, Evan ..	*Llandyfriog.* ..	*Cellan.*
Hughes, Stephen ..	*Mydrim*	*Swansea.*
Jones, David[1]	*Llanbadarn (Card.)*	*Pencarreg.*
Jones, Jenkin	*Llanthetty*	*Cilgerran.*
Jones, William ..	*Denbigh*	*Plas Teg (Flint).*
Joseph, Thomas[2] ..	*Llangeinor*	*Bridgend.*
Miller, Joshua ..	*St. Andrews* ..	*Wenvoe.*
Morgan, Reginald ..	*Vaynor*	*Bettws by Newport.*
Phillips, Peregrine ..	*Llangwm*	*Haverfordwest.*
Powell, John	*St. Lythans*.. ..	*Newport.*
Robinson, George ..	*Llangattock (Mon.)*	*Llantrisant (Mon.).*
Rogers, Hugh	*Newtown*	*Welshpool.*
Rowlands, Ellis ..	*Clynnog*	*Caernarvon.*
Thomas, Howell ..	*Glyncorrwg*	*Newton Nottage.*
Walter, Henry	*Newport*	*Caerleon.*
Williams, John ..	*Caernarvon*	*Llangian.*

And it was at these new homes they were settled in 1672, some of them dangerously near the five mile limit from the bounds of the parishes where once they were Puritan pastors. Parallel with this list there is a second, of men whose licences in that year prove that they were back in their old homes. Indirectly at least, they must have been allowed to remain there by the Indulgence officials and by more hostile authorities.

Minister.	*Former Sphere of Work.*	*Place of Refuge.*	*Where Licenced in 1672.*
Barnes, Thomas ..	*Magor* ..	*Bristol* ..	*Magor.*
Jones, Samuel	*Llangynwyd*	*Goitrehen* ..	*Llangynwyd*
Matthews, Marmaduke	*Swansea* ..	[*No record*]..	*Swansea.*
Roberts, Jonathan ..	*Llanfair D.C.*	[*No record*] ..	*Llanfair D.C.*
Weaver, John	*New Radnor*[3]	*Bettws-Diserth*	*New Radnor.*

1 For a further discussion of his case, see *infra*, pp. 115-116.

2 He must have moved to Bridgend before 1670. In that year he is named as one of four men in Wales from whom might be obtained the newly printed third part of *Cannwyll y Cymry* edited by Stephen Hughes (*Cymmrodor*, xiii, 10).

3 That John Weaver was once minister of *New Radnor* is proved by *Lambeth Augn. Book* 997, ii, 82. It was to his *house* in New Radnor, and not to himself as teacher, that a licence was issued in 1672 (*E.B.*, p. 255).

The first list of 22 is not only the longer, but is composed of the wiser men, keeping in mind how short-lived the Indulgence was going to prove. As an answer to the question at the head of this section, the shorter list of 5 is the more significant. Rowland Nevett of Oswestry was so closely connected with Wales that he might well swell it to six: although he had retired from his old pastorate to Weston in the same county, had made application in 1672 for a permit to preach at Oswestry and does not seem to have succeeded,[1] there is not the slightest evidence for thinking that a desire to observe the clause of the Five Mile Act was the underlying cause of the failure. That Act, like other components of the Clarendon Code, had for the time to lie dormant. Clause iv of the same Act laid a dead hand upon all unlicenced schools and their schoolmasters. How that clause fared under the Declaration must be left to a later chapter.

NOTE: TANNER MS. 146, ff. 138-138v.

Appeal is so often made to this letter in this and other chapters that some words about its date and authorship are called for. It has no date at the head, nor signature at the foot, nor endorsement of any kind. However, the words '[*by bp. Thomas*]' have been inserted in the margin by a modern hand. Dr. William Thomas was not promoted to the bishopric before 1677, while there is plenty of internal evidence that this letter was written before the licences were revoked. Stephen Hughes is referred to as 'lately licensed by His Majesty,' as a person excommunicate, and as a shameless intruder into several churches of the diocese. Is it likely that Dr. William Thomas would pile up these derogatory words about Stephen Hughes, seeing that the latter names the Anglican Doctor as one of the foremost in helping the movement to give the Welsh people the new translation of the Testament which appeared in 1672? (*Gwaith Mr. Rees Prichard*, Preface, [1-2], [24]). Stephen Hughes was the organiser of that movement. It follows that the letter was written by Bishop Lucy or a subordinate (its general style does not remind one of the military jerkiness of that dignitary's phraseology). The Catalogue of the *Tanner MSS.* does not assign it a date; but '1672' is found in the Index to the Catalogue. That might mean any date up to 24 March, 1673. The contents look very much like being an answer from St. David's to the inquiries about the catechising of youth and the growth of unlicenced schools sent out by Archbishop Sheldon on 6 February, 1672-1673 (Cardwell: *Docty. Annals*, ii, 286-287); indeed, this document might very well be the 'enclosed' particulars referred to by Lucy in his covering letter sent to the Archbishop from Brecon and dated 20 February, 1672-1673 (*Tanner MS.*, 146, f. 113). When it was written, James Picton the Quaker preacher and schoolmaster was spending a feverish freedom *between* his second and third imprisonments in Carmarthen gaol. It is known that the third began early in April 1673 (*Tanner MS.* 314, f. 40).

1 Cp. *S.P.321*, 237, with *E.B.*, pp. 215, 274. Lyon Turner in his summaries has badly misinterpreted these entries (*O.R.*, ii, 739).

XI.

LICENCE AGENTS.

(i) Their Rise.

In the preceding chapter reference was made to the large number of licences obtained by Samuel Jones of Llangynwyd. Here it becomes necessary to say that he never moved a foot from that parish to secure a single one of them. That was left in the hands of a licence agent. Whether the authorities originally meant the applicants to betake themselves to Arlington's lodgings and wait their turn in the purlieus of the Stone Gallery at Whitehall, is not at all certain [1]; however, the ingenious and enterprising mind of Dr. Nicholas Butler was the first to elaborate a new gloss on the Declaration. At the beginning of April he wants a secret appointment with Williamson 'in order to take some licences for some friends'[2]; on the following day he was sending copies of the sanctioned licence-forms into several parts, whether of the capital or of the outlying country is not clear[3]; on the 12th he is delegating a 'bearer' (who was a London ejected minister) to bring more licences from the offices[4]; later on, alleging that trouble is sometimes lawful, he is moving the chief secretary in favour of applicants from Birmingham.[5] Anon he gets somewhat tired of the business, and swears he will send for no more licences for any man's pleasure.[6] But a little later still, he was disgusted at the way he had forgotten the exact names of two Lancashire petitioners, fearing loss of credit by having to send to them for further information.[7] Once Williamson for some unascertained reason sent him back

1 An excellent plan of Whitehall, showing the quarters of Arlington and the gallery where applicants for licences had to walk and wait, was drawn up by a John Fisher in 1668. It forms an appendix to Arthur Dasent's new work on *Nell Gwynne* (1924).

2 *S.P. 320*, 31 (3 April).
3 *ib.*, 33.
4 *ib.*, 61.
5 *ib.*, 110, 112.
6 *ib.*, 152.
7 *ib.*, 198, 199.

four licences out of six unsigned.[1] Yet on the 23 April he is securing an interview (secret again) between another agent and the all-powerful Williamson[2]; on the 26th he says he has just received 200 blank licence-forms for 'places,' 100 for 'teachers at large,' 100 more blanks on 7 May, 900 two days later.[3] Armed with this immense sheaf of licence-forms his name disappears from the Indulgence State Papers (with the exception that next month he is making use of one of the licence agents to bring him the latest news of the English fleet, probably in reference to the Duke of York's victory over the Dutch at Southwold Bay on 28 May[4]).

Weeks before that date Butler's example had been widely followed, for on 6 April Edmund Calamy (the *second* of the name, be it emphasised) was asking the Scotsman James Innes to move his son, also named James, to get him a licence for the Curriers' Hall in St. Alphege parish[5]; on the same day the younger Innes is telling Williamson that he has solicited the services of Sir Thomas Clifford in favour of certain Devon applicants.[6] In time this Innes sent in to Whitehall no less than 388 applications.[7] But the record was easily held by the irrepressible John Hickes with his 515.[8]

(ii) Welshmen and Others.

The first licence that came to Wales did not depend upon agents. It was for *Marmaduke Matthews*[9] at his own house in the Swansea parish of St. John's. He seems to have sent in his application by letter to London, where it was received on 11 April; on the next day the actual licence was issued by Benson.[10] Although Marmaduke's early activities as a Puritan had such a touch of extremism that he migrated to New England before the wars and after his return was among those ejected in 1662, it is probable that his birth at Swansea, his academic connection with All Souls, and the mellow moderation of his

1 *S.P. 321*, 197A. This memorandum has become misplaced because of Butler's mistake in writing '8 February, 1672 (—1673)' instead of 'April, 1672' (*O.R.*, iii, 217). Its proper place is in *S.P. 320*.
2 *S.P. 320*, 185.
3 *S.P. 321*, 64.
4 *ib.*, 333.
5 *S.P. 320*, 34.
6 *ib.*, 35.
7 *O.R.*, iii, 627-631.
8 *ib.*, 599-602.
9 Wrongly named *Harris* in Bate, App. vii, p. lviii.
10 *S.P. 320*, 36, 37.

later years,[1] were not unknown at Whitehall. This in explanation of Benson's promptness. Matthews took care to describe himself as 'M^r^ of Arts,' a degree which he had held since 1627.

In the early stages the agent most to the fore in obtaining Welsh licences was *Richard Steele*, the Cambridge M.A. of St. John's who had been ousted from the living of Hanmer in 1662. He was one of Philip Henry's bosom friends (Steele attended at the ordination of Philip the father and Matthew the son) who after a life of great activity as a preacher in illegal conventicles which were reported in 1669 from the archdeaconry of Shrewsbury,[2] moved to London shortly afterwards, and seems to have found easy access into the most exclusive Presbyterian houses. He was one of the five preachers at the Countess of Exeter's on 24 August, 1671,[3] and by 1672 he had taken up his quarters in a 'room or roomes' at Westmoreland House near St. Bartholomew's Close, for which he received a licence on the first day they were issued.[4] As a piquant proof of the changed atmosphere in London from the draconism of the second Conventicle Act to the homeliness of the Indulgence officials, the State Papers show Richard Steele arranging with the latter to send licences to his house or 'roomes' for distribution.[5] It is not likely that he would forget his old friend Philip Henry at this auspicious turn in affairs: for the latter's licence three separate applications were made, two by Steele and one by another, with the result that it was issued on 30 April for his own house of Broad Oak in the parish of Malpas.[6]

On periodical visits to London about this time was a very different man, a thorough Welshman of the name *Stephen Hughes*, ejected from the living of Mydrim in 1661, and now engaged in that pious propaganda for the good of is countrymen which bore fruit in new Welsh translations of the Bible and of other works of devotion. The probability

1 *Noncon. Mem.*, iii, 504. For his Oxford connections, see Andrew Clark: *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, iii, 440. It is not very generally known that Matthews had at some time before 1670 written a little book containing a *Reconciling Remonstrance* (pp. 1-39) and a *Shrill-Sounding Whisper to a Sin-Loving Soul* (pp. 57-68), the former prefixed by very rugged verse, and the latter followed by 'a postcript or appendix '(pp. 69-120). On this matter, see *C.H.S.T.*, v, 54-58.

2 *Lambeth MS.* 639, ff. 192, 193, 197b.

3 Philip Henry: *Diaries*, p. 241.

4 *E.B.*, p. 5 (2 April).

5 *S.P. 320*, 127.

6 *ib.*, 87, 127, 128; *E.B.*, p. 49.

of these two ejected ministers having met in London early in 1672 is brought very near certainty when we remember that Hughes addressed a hortatory letter to sympathetic supporters in Wales, on 20 March, 1671-1672, and that from St. Bartholomew's Close, in the near neighbourhood of Steele's headquarters.[1] This was five days after the Declaration was given to the world. Very soon afterwards Steele is making application for two licences on behalf of Hughes, one for the house of the widow Jenkins at Pencader, one for the house of Evan Morris at Llanstephan.[2] Both were granted and issued on 17 April.[3] No doubt Hughes prevailed upon this influential agent to include a friend of his who had newly come up to the capital—*Daniel Higgs* of Swansea, the Worcestershire native and graduate of Magdalen Hall who migrated into Wales in the days of the Propagation,[4] settled down at Rhossilly in Gower about 1653, was moved therefrom in 1660 by the Act of September, received instead the rectory of Porteynon under the Great Seal,[5] and lost that again in 1662. Steele made an effort to get permission for Higgs to preach both at his own house in Swansea and at the old discarded Puritan school-house there. But the licence issued on 20 April only mentioned the house.[6] Higgs and Hughes now tried their hands as licence agents by the naïve stratagem of getting further licences for each other. They were only comparatively successful. Higgs succeeded in obtaining a licence for Stephen's house at Swansea (the latter had married a Swansea lady of good circumstances whose Christian name was Catherine[7]), but the actual document did not refer to either Higgs or Hughes by name as having liberty to preach in it; after he and Hughes had applied for them in two separate memoranda, Higgs also succeeded in obtaining licences for three meeting places in Gower (at Bishopston, Nicholaston and Rhossilly), with the important lacuna that his own name was not found definitely associated with them as 'teacher.'[8]

1 *Gwaith Mr. Rees Prichard* (1672), letter prefixed, [25].
2 *S.P. 320*, 84, 86.
3 *E.B.*, p. 26.
4 *MS. J. Walker*, c. 13, ff. 22, 39.
5 *Pat. Rolls*, 12 Chas. II, part 1, No. 269 (dated 17 August, 1660). This date suggests that Higgs secured Porteynon in *intelligent anticipation* of the Act of September, knowing that the old Anglican rector was still alive.
6 Cp. *S.P. 320*, 84, with *E.B.*, p. 26.
7 Thos. Shankland: *Beirniad*, Oct. 1912, p. 178.
8 For all these developments, cp. *S.P. 320*, 233, 234, with *E.B.*, p. 39.

Stephen Hughes, however, succeeded in bringing important blessings to a group of Puritans in the west: to Peregrine Phillips for two houses in Haverfordwest, to James Davies at Cardigan, to Jenkin Jones at Cilgerran.[1] And it was he who was instrumental in getting his two first licences to Samuel Jones, one for Goitrehen and one for his own house at Llangynwyd.[2] The transaction witnessed a little mishap by a Philistine clerk putting the 'old parish' of Llangynwyd in Pembrokeshire. Hughes' application, written in a large ungainly hand, does not leave much doubt as to the particular county Llangynwyd was in[3]; when he came to 'receive out' the actual licence, his signature of receipt makes no mention of a clerical mistake[4] which in turn raises the question whether the document sent by him to Glamorgan agreed in all particulars with the record on p. 50 of the *Entry Book*. A question which cannot be answered unless and until the licence of Samuel Jones comes to unexpected light. Did the clerk get mixed up with the licences granted to Peregrine Phillips of Pembrokeshire, issued on the same day as those for Jones, and entered in close proximity on the records? Only the house licence for Goitrehen comes between them. That, however, is correctly described as being in Glamorgan.

Besides these, other agents were busy, some of them very obscure men. Not so the younger *James Innes*, who for some mysterious reason secured licences for two householders of Uzmaston in Pembroke[5]; nor *Nehemiah Lyde*, the goldsmith's apprentice hailing from Hereford and living next door to the King's Head tavern near Somerset House,[6] who helped Richard Steele in putting in the third application for Philip Henry. But who was the *Owen Davies* who tried and failed to get Daniel Higgs a licence for the house of Thomas Williams at Swansea,[7] and who according to Lyon Turner was enthusiastic enough to leave applications at Arlington's offices on a *Sunday*?[8] What made him, if a Welshman, to describe Swansea as in 'pembrockshyere' on *S. P. 320*, 85, in the

1 *E.B.*, pp. 51 (Phillips), 85 (Davies, Jones).
2 *E.B.*, p. 50 (30 April).
3 *S.P. 320*, 234.
4 *ib.*, 235.
5 *S.P. 321*, 364, 364b; *E.B.*, p. 173.
6 *O.R.*, iii, 546-548.
7 *S.P. 320*, 85.
8 *S.P. 321*, 273 (26 May); *O.R.*, iii, 518.

aforesaid effort to get Williams' house licenced ?[1] Numerous theories have been advanced regarding who exactly he was, especially Turner's very tentative suggestion that he was a native of Llanddeiniolen who graduated at Jesus College, Oxford, in 1650, and Alexander Gordon's more confident belief that he was the minister of that name who was pastor at Swansea from 1691 to 1693.[2] But bearing in mind that the Owen Davies of 1672 applied for 80 licences and signed receipts for 52, one half of which were for Gloucestershire, it is more natural to adopt the Rev. John Stanley's suggestion that he was the Owen Davies who was minister of an Independent church at Mitcheldean in that county in 1715 (this has the serious weakness of being 43 years after 1672).[3]

On 28 May a sheaf of licences, including those for Jonathan Roberts at Llanfair, for John Evans at Wrexham, for Hugh Owen in the parish of Llanegryn—was carried away by a certain *William Owen*.[4] The fact that Hugh Owen's licence was one of these inclines Turner to think that this William was a brother of his, or connected with a Griffith Owen who made a will in 1668 leaving charity moneys to parishioners of Llanegryn.[5] Neither conjecture is improbable ; but it is rather surprising, if William Owen was a close relative of Hugh's and a big enough nonconformist to put in applications (altogether) for 29 licences, that some reference was not made to him by Calamy or by the compiler of the *Nonconformist Memorial*. It is the opinion of a writer in *Enwogion y Ffydd* that Hugh was the only son of his father.[6]

There remains the equally obscure *William Jones* who as agent took out seven Monmouth licences on 17 June.[7] The dependant of the Trevors, William Jones of Plas Têg, can be unhesitatingly ruled out ; otherwise we have Gwentian licences sought by a Flintshire minister who forgot to secure one for himself until some months afterwards. The claims of the strict Baptist leader of Rhydwilym, another William Jones, need not be cast aside simply because he did not

1 In the next document (*S.P. 320*, 86) Francis Benson went further and placed Swansea in *Lancashire*.
2 *O.R.*, iii, 519. The writer has failed to find his name among the graduates figuring in *Reg. Congregation QA*, 1647-1659 (University Archives).
3 *Bapt. Hist. Soc. Trans.*, iii, 119.
4 *S.P. 321*, 277.
5 *O.R.*, iii, 426-430.
6 Part (or 'Dosbarth') ii, 480.
7 *S.P. 321*, 373.

move to get a licence for himself, since his prominent Baptist contemporary William Kyffin of London, who seemed to hold similar views about the Indulgence, applied for no less than eight to oblige friends in London and the country without attempting to secure one for himself.[1] Rather must the Rhydwilym Jones be eliminated on the ground of geographical absurdity. Was there no William Jones in Monmouthshire itself likely to interest himself in the matter ? Unfortunately, William Jones of the Priory of Usk, an old Commissioner for the Propagation, had died before the conventicle inquiries of 1669, as it is his widow who harboured a secret meeting there in that year.[2] There is left the *Wil. J.* who with Henry Walter of Newport suffered blows from swords and staves at Llantarnam at the close of a Sabbath day early in July 1660.[3] It is not altogether a coincidence that two of the licences received on 17 June were for Henry Walter to preach at his own house of Parc y Pill in the aforesaid parish of Llantarnam.[4] Most probably the agent William Jones is to be sought among the ' godly ministers ' produced by the gathered churches of Mynyddislwyn and Llanfaches during Propagation times.[5] Two men of this name were amongst the subscribers of the *Humble Address* to Cromwell in 1656, with their signatures not far removed from those of Henry Walter and Walter Cradock[6]—one being William Jones of Usk, and the other (it is here presumed) the agent for Monmouth licences in 1672.

(iii) The Building of a Table.

Further discussion on licence procedure must wait for a few words on the question of dating these documents. It is a curious fact that over 60 of the Welsh licences have no date whatsoever attached to them in the *Entry Book ;* but it is highly natural to believe that a licence entered on a certain page of that book with no specified date must have been issued on the same day as other licences which happen to be dated and which appear in close proximity to them. On the ground that Baxter's licence granted on 27 October appears in the *Entry Book*

1 *S.P. 321*, 179.
2 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 188b.
3 *Lord's Loud Call to England* [Thomason Colln., E. 1038. 8], p. 26. Letter sent from Newport, 12 July, 1660.
4 *E.B.*, p. 166.
5 *H.P.M.*, p. 151.
6 Both on p. 7 of the B.M. copy. 'Names' would be more correct than 'signatures.' The Address contains none of the latter.

side by side with others far removed from that date,[1] and that a Kentish place-licence issued to a widow named Elizabeth Hopden ought on the ' proximity ' theory to be granted on 9 December[2] turns out on examination of the preserved original to have been given out exactly a month before, Professor Lyon Turner looks very much askance at this argument. That is his state of mind on pp. 16-19 of his third volume of the *Original Records*. Further on in that same volume his early doubts seem to have vanished : in the analysis of the days of the month set apart by Arlington to sign Indulgence licences he does not make that easy-going earl to sign these documents *except on dates actually entered on the Entry Book*[3] *;* also the principle once attacked by him is adopted later on in conjecturing the dates of certain licences obtained for Hull and South Yorkshire, for Samuel Clayton at Rotherham, and in discussing at least nine other cases in the volume.[4] The safest argument is that from common sense. It is not wise to erect anomaly into a rule. As for the Welsh licences undated, the ' proximity ' deduction will be ruthlessly applied in the course of this work (especially as none of these particular licences west of the Dyke have survived to act as inconvenient rebutters).

It is to be noted too that not more than a quarter of the licences that arrived in Wales can be definitely traced to the medium of agents : the group taken out by William Jones is the last so attested in the State Papers.[5] But the consideration that 8 were issued to Radnor on 18 November, 11 to Caernarvonshire on 5 September, 12 to Cardigan and North Carmarthen on 28 October, and no less than 27 to Monmouth and east Glamorgan on 10 August, point to the inevitable conclusion that some enterprising licence-agents were at work. Seven licences were given out at Whitehall to claimants from Brecknock, Radnor and Glamorgan, on the very last day any licences were signed at all. The cogency of this reasoning is a little impaired by the officials' practice not to sign licences except on certain days in the month—in August on three

1 *E.B.*, p. 272.
2 *ib*, pp. 279, 280.
3 p. 264.
4 pp. 414, 424, 427, 434-435, 528 (three cases), 560, 562, 603, 758-759.
5 It should be kept in mind that *St. Papers 320 & 321* do not record applications for licences or their receipt after the month of *June* 1672.

days only, in September on two, in October on one, in November on two—that is, applications might have been presented in October on any day between 30 September (the second of the two signature days in that month) and the 28th of October itself (the only signature day), and all signed in a big batch on this 28th. Even when this possibility is given due weight, the impression still remains that they were given in by an agent or agents.

To sum up, the following table has been compiled as an illustration of the agents' activities in London (recorded and unrecorded), and as incorporating the results of the proximity rule concerning dates of issue. The licences for teachers and places are counted separately ; ' implied ' houses are invested with the dignity of separate licences[1] : in other words, this table gives the most generous interpretation to the working of the Indulgence. It differs in so many respects from the account given by Professor Lyon Turner that it is a weariness of the pen to point out the details. For example, he finds 9 licences given out for Flintshire *on May* 1 when not one was issued there on that date, and a total of 16 under the Indulgence when only 8 arrived there all told.[2] Nor does it make for accuracy to count William Jones of Plas Têg in the county of Denbigh instead of in the county of Flint.

1 A house-licence is ' implied ' when only the *teacher's* licence is actually recorded. For example, *E.B.*, p. 286, states that a preaching permit was granted to Thomas Evans at Llanafanfawr in Brecknock, but there is not a word of the place he was to preach in. He was *not* a ' general ' teacher.

2 *O.R.*, iii, 710-711. He flatly contradicts his own summaries in ii, 1197.

	April 12, 1672	" 17	" 20	" 30	May 8	" 13	" 20	" 22	" 28	June 10	" 15	July 16	" 22	" 25	Aug. 10	Sept. 5	" 30	Oct. 28	Nov. 18	Dec. 9	Feb. 3, 1673	TOTAL.
Caernarvon	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	—	—	—	—	—	11
Denbigh ..	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	6	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	2	4	—	—	16
Flint ..	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	2	—	—	—	8
Merioneth..	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	1	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6
Montgomery	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	3	1	1	2	—	—	8
Brecknock	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	3	6
Cardigan ..	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	—	—	—	13
Carmarthen	—	4	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	1	—	—	—	11
Glamorgan	2	2	4	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	8	—	—	4	—	4	—	2	—	2	42
Monmouth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	1	—	5	3	23	1	—	—	—	—	—	39
Pembroke	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8
Radnor ..	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	8	6	2	17

185 { 49 (N.W.) 136 (S.W.).

(iv) Fees and Formalities.

Some of the agents were so enthusiastic that the recipients did not know the licences were coming their way until they actually received them: 'this day,' writes Philip Henry on 7 May, 1672, 'I receiv'd my licences [for himself and house] unsought and unexpected, procur'd by Mr. Steel, sent in a post letter to Mr. Yates who had publisht it before I knew it.'[1] Nor did Henry then know that no less than three applications had been made for them, and that some days had elapsed between the third and the date of issue. It was a deliberate act of Steele's arising out of their ancient friendship and the very recent generosity of Henry and others in providing ('ex dono amicorum') for the agent's children in English Flint while their father was away in London. Did not Henry himself buy the daughter Sal a vest worth 11/10? Henry's licence was the answer to Sal's vest.[2] It was Sir Thomas Player, Chamberlain of London, who procured the licence for Baxter[3]; nor was Oliver Heywood of Halifax expecting that licence of his which for some mysterious reason gave such umbrage to the officials at Lambeth House and made them bring accusations of 'ill nature' against the Whitehall clerks[4]; and is it likely that Francis Bampfield in Dorchester gaol was altogether aware of the licence made out at Whitehall on 29 June, written on parchment though it was, and 'by my L[d] Clifford's Order'?[5] What advantage was there in giving him indulgence to preach in any licenced place if he was not discharged from that gaol till 1675?[6] Was the whole incident a subtle scheme of the Devon Caballer to ingratiate himself with the preacher's two brothers, the one a baronet and the other Recorder of Exeter? According to one of the *State Papers* Bunyan was in Bedford prison as late as 8 May (it was on that day the King's Council ordered his freedom)[7]; on the following day his licence was issued by Arlington's

1 *Diaries*, pp. 251-252.
2 *ib.*, p. 236.
3 Calamy: *Acct.* (1713), i, 335. It is a fact, nevertheless, that Baxter did apply for a licence through an un-named agent, and that by letter only two days before the licence was actually issued. F. J. Powicke refuses to see any relation between letter and licence (*Richard Baxter under the Cross*, 71-72). It is not very easy to agree with him.
4 Calamy: *Acct.* (1713), ii, 807; *supra*, p. 67.
5 *E.B.*, p. 190.
6 Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 258-261
7 *Extracts from St. Papers relating to Friends*, ed. Penney, pp. 347, 348.

clerk.[1] And it was Colonel Thomas Blood who was the chief agent in freeing him and many others.

The London Chamberlain, my Lord Clifford, and quite as certainly Richard Steele, can all be acquitted of any desire to make money over these activities. So indeed can Lord Holles over the 14 applications he put in on 16 May,[2] the Lord Craven who promised to call at Arlington's lodgings for the Coventry licence of Dr. John Bryan,[3] and the wealthy East Indiaman baronet Sir John Banks who exerted himself to get permision for a certain Presbyterian to preach near Maidstone.[4] Apart from these and such like cases, the question of fees is not unattended with difficulty. Although it is not expressly stipulated in the Declaration, there is not much doubt that the King and his Council meant the licences to be absolutely free of charge. But they could hardly have present in their minds the horde of clerks, attendants and porters necessary to work the Indulgence (many of them expecting some honorarium), nor the larger horde of agents summoned into being by the new situation (some of them not unnaturally expecting some gratuity). As usual, Dr. Nicholas Butler is first in the field with dicta on this matter: writing on 4 April to a Dissenter in the country, he assured the latter the licences would not cost a penny[5]; before the end of the same month he seems to upbraid Williamson for giving out licences for nothing, calls the Chief Secretary a sufferer and himself a troubled fellow feeler for letting the applicants go scot free[6]; on the last day of April he affirms he gets nothing from his activities but 'expense of money and time.'[7] Nearly a month before this, in a postscript of a letter to Sir Joseph, he had assumed he was free to pay one of the Whitehall porters for little services rendered, but was very careful to add that he hoped no one believed he (Butler) expected to be repaid by anybody (that is, by any licencee).[8] An applicant from the Midlands is willing to satisfy an agent for his charges (that agent being no other

1 *E.B.*, p. 93.
2 *S.P. 321*, 166.
3 *ib.*, 173.
4 *ib.*, 264.
5 This letter is not in *S.P. 320*. Prof. Lyon Turner came across it in Jerom Murch: *Presbyterians and General Baptists in the West of England*, p. 378 (*O.R.*, iii, 205-206).
6 *S.P. 320*, 170.
7 *ib.*, 210.
8 *ib.*, 33.

than the clerk to the London Company of Haberdashers).[1] The same principle applies to licence-petitioners from Lewes in Sussex.[2]

Then on 14 May comes a startling letter from Col. Thomas Blood to a surgeon of Romford who acted as agent for some Essex ministers, saying with one breath there was no charge for licences, 'onely it is agreed that 5*s.* apiece for the personall Licences should be gotten and y^e^ dorkeepers and underclarkes should afterward be remembered by a token of love.'[3] Blood seems to have detained these licences in his own hand; they were dated 2 May, and his letter twelve days later. This roused one of the ministers to high wrath: licences for houses, he writes on the 16th, signify nothing without a person [teacher]: would it not be more courteous of Blood to leave the gratuity to their honour than impose a fixed sum 'contrary to y^e^ King^es^ Co^m^and that nothinge should be required'? He asks the surgeon of Romford to write officially to the Colonel 'right smartly' about the matter. This letter of Thomas Gilson's (the minister in question) must have been taken to Arlington's offices by the surgeon in person; and the fact that it (as well as a copy) is to-day to be seen at the State Paper Office is a most cogent proof that Sir Joseph Williamson and Francis Benson thought it to be of considerable importance.[4] Whether the 5 – fee was ever paid must be left in abeyance; the law of probability favours the negative. When W. C. Abbott rashly says that Blood as licence agent drove a thriving trade,[5] he ignores this indignant protest of Gilson's, the darkening frowns of Sir Joseph, and the fact that in comparison with Hickes, the younger Innes and many others, the activities of Blood in this direction were very lukewarm indeed. As somewhat unsubstantial palliatives of the Colonel's viewpoint come a queer rumour and the provisions of an abortive bill. On 19 July in the year before the Indulgence Philip Henry heard that each person was to pay 5/– 'nomine poenæ' if he determined to remain a

1 *S.P. 320*, 191.
2 *ib.*, 209.
3 *S.P. 321*, 143 (copy), 144 (original). Bate, p. 95, makes this to be 5d., not 5/-. Turner corrects him in iii, 506. An examination of the MS. undoubtedly favours Turner and the 5/-.
4 *ib.*, 170, 171—Thomas Gilson to Wm. Mascall, chirurgeon, 'att y^e^ 3 conyes in Romford.'
5 *Col. Thos. Blood, Crown-Stealer*, pp. 85-86.

nonconformist[1]; in the bill 'for the ease of Dissenters' introduced in 1673 it was declared that 2/6 in all was due to the authorities (J.P.'s and the clerk of Quarter Sessions) for each licence given out under that bill if it ever became an Act.[2] It must be confessed that the rumour of 1671 and the clause of 1673 between them create an atmosphere not unfavourable to Blood's craving for crowns in 1672. That does not say that he got them. And it is safe to say that the £59 12s. 6d. scrawled at the left-hand corner of *S. P. 321*, 282 (receipt of three Norwich licences) must be some casual calculation of that particular licence agent: licences would be rather dear at £19 17s. 6d. apiece.

As a sidelight on some of the work-a-day aspects of the Indulgence, the dicta of Butler and the demands of Blood merit very close consideration. As a contribution to our particular story—the response of Wales to the King's new terms—they are not of great moment: there is not a shred of evidence to prove that any of the Welsh licence agents asked for fees, still less that any Welsh beneficiary wrote 'smart' letters to refuse them. At the same time, let us devoutly hope that men like William Owen and William Jones did not go unremembered by a token of love. The relations between Henry and Steele have already been touched upon. Henry's surprise licence prompts a new poser: would even Blood ask for his crown for sending a licence to a man who had never asked for it?

The incidents attending Philip Henry's two licences are also interesting as showing the time taken for them to come from London (about a week), as opposed to Heywood's at Halifax (more than a fortnight). They are more important as evidence of the formalities necessary upon their arrival. Each licence had to be shown to the local Justices of Peace, 'who endors'd their names on the Back-side.'[3] In this context it behoves us to say that Professor Lyon Turner refers to Dorchester licencees gratuitously bringing their licences

1 *Diaries*, p. 240.

2 *Tanner MS.* 43, cp. ff. 189, 192-192v. It is possible to read into the loose phrases of this bill that 3/6 was required (1/- to the J.P.'s, 2/6 to the Quarter Sessions clerk, the second fee 'only for those who forbeare to hold meetings until Q.S. are held.' This 2/6 looks like being a new kind of fine upon fanaticism). It is also worth noting that the framers of the abortive licence bill of *1663*, according to Clarendon, had prepared an elaborate schedule showing the amount to be paid by each recipient (Bate, p. 37, n. 8).

3 *Diaries*, p. 254.

to the Town Hall ' so that all the Town officials might know,' and puts that procedure down as unique.[1] Was it not rather, in the light of Henry's diaries, their bounden duty so to do ? These diaries prove also that the Flintshire Puritan preached at a licenced meeting-place in Wrexham on 3 July, twelve days before he produced his own licence to Sir Thomas Hanmer of Hanmer. The latter ' perus'd it, but said little,' a silence somewhat more significant than Henry at the time probably thought it.[2] *After* this examination by the magistrate, it was the preacher's privilege to preach in such places as came within the terms of his licence or licences. The sad alternative was the King's ' all imaginable severity.'

NOTE : BEIRNIAD, 1912, 179.

In the course of an excellent article on ' Stephen Hughes ' the late Mr. Shankland has on this page given some attention to his activity as licence agent during the months of April and May, 1672. But that usually careful writer has not been too fortunate in his interpretation of the records. He says that on *30 April* Hughes through the agency of Higgs applied for permission to have his own house at Swansea licenced. The application was made on *S. P. 320*, 233, to which no date whatsoever is attached ; since p. 39 of *E. B.* proves the licence to have been issued on the *20th*, why make application for it ten days afterwards ? According to Mr. Shankland, it was Hughes in person, this again on *30 April*, who applied for the Llanstephan and Pencader licences. That application is preserved on *S. P. 320*, 84 (no date affixed), and is very surely not in Stephen's handwriting, but in that of Richard Steele's. As these licences were dated 17 April (*E. B.*, p. 26), again it must be asked what was the necessity for troubling the officials 13 days later ?

1 *O.R.*, iii, 330.
2 *Diaries*, p. 254.

XII.

GENERAL TEACHERS.

(i) The Welsh Five.

On 29 May the authorities at Whitehall were pleased to make out no less than four general licences to persons in the one town of Canterbury[1]—Canterbury of all places, and one of the four an old Cromwellian officer, 'a ringleader of the petition for the King's trial.'[2] Throughout Wales such a comprehensive privilege was enjoyed by five persons only, and even to make up that total Charles Edwards has to be drawn in from across the Oswestry border. The other four were Richard Jones of Ruabon,[3] David Jones of Pencarreg in Carmarthen[4] (these two were both licenced on 28 October), John Powell of Newport (on 10 June), and Joshua Lloyd of the Llanfaches district five days later.[5] It is true that Marmaduke Matthews of Swansea had applied for such a licence, but the exact words of the *Entry Book* leave no room for doubt that his ministrations were to be confined to his own house in the parish of 'St. Jones by Swanzey,' in which he would 'preach to his Congreg[ac]ons.'[6]

Of *Richard Jones* nothing is known in contemporary records unless he be the same person as the Richard Jones who had been Puritan schoolmaster at Denbigh under the Triers and who was to die at that town in 1673[7]; the difficulty in the *second case* is whether to agree with Lyon Turner's suggestion that he was David Jones ejected from Llandisilio by the King's use of the Great Seal in 1660, or with Alexander Gordon's belief that he was the David Jones ejected from Llanbadarnfawr in August 1662.[8] In his edition of the

1 *E.B.*, p. 143.
2 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 154.
3 *E.B.*, p. 261.
4 *ib.*, p. 266.
5 *ib.*, p. 170 (both).
6 *S.P. 320*, 36, 37 (most probably the plural is a slip).
7 Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 844.
8 *O.R.*, ii, 1206-1207 (misplaced under Cardiganshire); *Freedom after Ejection*, pp. 293-294.

Broadmead Records, which contained as an appendix the letter sent in 1675 to one of the elders of that church by Henry Maurice, Mr. E. B. Underhill saw well to fill up illegible fag-ends about a David Jones who was pastor of a gathered church in Cardiganshire as Llan[badarn fawr] and Pen[brin][1]; but there is an equally good, if not better, ground for reading Llan[bedr pont Stephan] and Pen[carreg]. That would bring the David Jones of 1675 into very close contact with the general teacher of 1672, without our being very much wiser regarding his true personality. The David Jones who received a personal licence for his own house at Llanddewibrefi[2] must be held to be a different person from the Jones of Pencarreg, unless indeed Llan[ddewibrefi] was the word written down in Maurice's original handwriting. In that case David Jones is erected into one of the wide-awake Puritans who succeeded in securing two types of licences, and the two on the same day. In any case, David Jones of Pencarreg was alive in 1690 and for about ten years afterwards.[3]

With *John Powell* much firmer ground is reached. He had been ejected from St. Lythans in Glamorgan in 1660, had appeared in the returns of 1669 as an enterprising itinerant roaming from Marshfield in Monmouth to Eglwysilan in Glamorgan,[4] and was to be described just before his death in 1691 as pastor of the Independent church at Newport—'an aged & Sickly man, low in y^e^ world, liues upon a small farm upon y^e^ Rack rent of 8*l* p^r^ annum.'[5] In 1672, however, a piece of good luck befel him. In his application for a licence he wished leave to preach at the Newport market-house, which the authorities did not see their way to grant; instead, they allowed him to be a 'Grall Ind[ependent],' an adjective which seems to have escaped the notice of his licence agent William Jones.[6] By some mischance Professor Lyon Turner puts it that he received a general licence 'only,'[7] a depreciatory adverb which leads one to think that Powell would have preferred the market-house. It is not very likely that John

1 Addenda B, p. 512. This was the edition of 1847. "*A Catalogue of all the congregated churches in the general counties of Wales, together with the names of their pastors and other church officers.*"
2 *E.B.*, p. 266.
3 *Gordon MS.* f. 94; *Freedom after Ejection*, 293-294.
4 *Lambeth MS.* 639, ff. 187, 188.
5 *Gordon MS.* (D.W.L.), f. 94.
6 *S.P. 321*, 353 (application), 373 (receipt).
7 *O.R.*, iii, 681

Powell would indulge in vain regrets at the loss of the market-house (which, after all, would have been a restricted personal licence), if the document he actually carried gave him permission to visit every licenced Independent meeting-place in the whole county (and country).

From the vicissitudes of his application and from respect to his probable descent *Joshua Lloyd* demands a paragraph for himself. There are some good grounds for believing that he was the fourth son of Morgan Llwyd o Wynedd who had gravitated to his mother's old haunts around Llanfaches, much on the same reasoning that the *one Lloyd*—'a pretended Scholar of New Inn Hall in Oxford'[1]—who figured in the same area in the conventicle returns of 1669 may be equated with Llwyd's eldest son David. Very relevant to these Llwydian problems are the father's own rhymed autobiography in which he announces his Gwentian marriage without definitely saying his wife was a Gwentian lady,[2] Principal J. H. Davies' list of Llwyd's descendants which does not preclude Joshua's activities in 1672 on the score of youth,[3] and an extract from Anthony Wood's papers at the Bodleian, which implies very strongly that the one 'Lloyd' of *Lambeth MS.* 639 was David Lloyd of New Inn Hall.[4] That the weary steps of research have halted at this penultimate stage of discovery does not detract from the interest of the entries in the Indulgence State Papers concerning the Joshua Lloyd of 1672, be he Llwyd's son or be he not. To begin with, the application made out for him by William Jones and preserved in *S. P. 321*, 353, has this unsatisfactory appearance :—

'Mr. ~~Joshua~~ Lloyd Independt, ~~Itinen~~ Itinerant (if possible).'

The clerk in turn made the 'It' of 'Itinerant' to be H, the 'i' to be 'e', the 'r' to be 's', and so arrived at the word 'Henesant,' with the result that the official licence was recorded as follows :—'*Licence to Josuah Lloyd of Henesant, Monmouth, to be a Grall Ind. Teacher*, 15 *June*.'[5] When William Jones called for it to sign the receipt, he must have pointed

1 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f.186b.
2 *Gweithiau*, i, Song xxvii—"Hanes rhyw Gymro."
3 *ib.*, ii, pp. 314-315.
4 *Life and Times*, i, 454-455.
5 *E.B.*, p. 170.

out the clerical error and the geographical absurdity. Lloyd did become an itinerant after all under the guise of a general teacher. But *Henesant* was not to be one of his places of call, for the simple reason that no such place existed in Monmouth or elsewhere. In the document of receipt, it must be said, the word 'Itinerant' was rudely blotted out either by the receiver William Jones or by the clerk who stood by.[1] It is true also that, as a natural corollary of the clerk's first misapprehension, p. 166 of the *Entry Book* records a licence for Lloyd's *house* in this same mythical Henesant,[2] a document at once amplified and superseded by the above entry on p. 170. In a seventeenth century transcript of *E. B.*, p. 166, at the Bodleian Library the word 'Henesant' appears as 'Henerant'[3]; it is practically certain that another scribe copying *that* would bring the word back by a cyclic order to the 'Itinerant' of William Jones in *S. P. 321*, 353. The crosses and blots which obfuscated the desires of Joshua Lloyd in the vagaries of the State Papers have been reflected in the works of Lyon Turner and Frank Bate: the former. in his Monmouthshire summaries has localised the 'general' teacher under Shirenewton,[4] and the latter has transformed an Independant into a Presbyterian.[5] There is not an iota of justification in the records for either.

On the basis of literary fame *Charles Edwards* was well worthy of the general licence which was issued him on 10 August, 1672.[6] As a Puritan minister few deserved it less. From that day in June, 1648, when he refused to submit to the Puritan Visitors as member of All Souls,[7] to his repeated refusals in 1690 to accept £8 a year from the London Common Fund declaring he was *not* 'inclineable to betake himselfe to his ministry' *unless* a salaried maintenance was given him,[8] his record is far from satisfactory. Though turned out from All Souls, he managed to submit to the Visitors some months later, and to get elected by them as a Scholar on the reorganised foundation of Jesus[9]; he graduated, fell a prey to the

1 *S.P. 321*, 373.
2 This has escaped the notice of Lyon Turner in *O.R.*, ii, 1226. He does refer to it in iii, 538.
3 *Jones MS.* 22, ff. 20, 22v.
4 *O.R.*, ii, 1226.
5 App. vii, p. xl.
6 *E.B.*, p. 234.
7 Montagu Burrows: *Register of the Parliamentary Visitors*, p. 122.
8 *Gordon MS.*, f. 62; *Freedom after Ejection*, pp. 257-258.
9 Burrows: *Register*, p. 177.

turbulent atmosphere of the Welsh college at that period, and is next heard of as Propagation itinerant at a salary of £60 per annum[1]; very near to the end of the Puritan era he succeeded two excellent pastors as rector of Llanrhaiadr ym Mochnant, only to erase an important postscript on his certificate of election.[2] Notwithstanding this lapse, he was re-sanctioned to the living by the Triers.[3] However, as a new rector was presented to that rectory at the beginning of 1659, Edwards must have lost it, a loss which explains how James Owen could not inform Calamy that Charles Edwards was ejected either by the Act of September or by the Act of Uniformity. He was not in possession to be ejected. Before long he is found at Oxford where in 1666 he brought out his *Hanes y Ffydd*: before his more famous edition—*Hanes y Ffydd Ddiffuant*—was published in 1671 he had made the acquaintance once more of that academic outlaw and wonderful opportunist, the Dr. Michael Roberts who was so-called Puritan Head of Jesus from 1648 to 1657. Roberts could not find in the second *Hanes* anything derogatory to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, and testified in Latin to that effect.[4] No doubt this was done to give the work an easy time with the Anglican censors at Oxford.

Of his activities under the Indulgence no record has survived. One can be tolerably certain that they were not very extended, and that his public utterances were in the same exacerbated strain as his autobiography. The fact that Edwards was not reported as conventicle teacher outside Oswestry in 1669 suggests very strongly he had no settled following of nonconformists, did we not know from other sources of his long visits to Oxford to superintend the publication of his books; just after the withdrawal of the Indulgence there is a very strong probability that he was the 'Mr. Edwards' who was at the University town telling Anthony Wood of the death of Thomas Ellis, the learned antiquary who had been rector of Dolgelley since 1666.[5]

Here it might be convenient to say that though the early

1 *H.P.M.*, 148, 153.
2 *Lambeth Augn. Bk.* 1004, f. 50.
3 *ib.*, 998, f. 34, No. 99.
4 It is on 24 July, 1676, that Dr. Roberts wrote out the Latin testimonial, but the terms of it seem to show that he had read and re-read the 1671 edition.
5 *Life and Times*, ii, 262 (under 24 April, 1673).

official idea to grant 'general' licences only to those who 'had not a people' was almost immediately discarded, yet this theory will work very well in the four other Welsh cases, as well as in that of Charles Edwards. Three years previously, John Powell was concentrating his energies on *West* Monmouth and had not come to the Newport district; it is possible that Joshua Lloyd only came to Netherwent with the advent of the Indulgence[1]; the available evidence suggests that by 1672 both Richard and David Jones were considerably removed from their sometime Puritan headquarters. But to remind us how fluid and unstable such reasoning is, it is to be noted that Powell's *first* application was for a *particular* licence, and that Lloyd was in two minds whether his should be general or particular, as testified by the words 'if possible' in *S. P., 321*, 353.

(ii) The Case of Daniel Williams.

Was it possible under the Indulgence for a Dublin pastor to have permission to preach at Wrexham in Wales? This is another way of saying that the problem of Daniel Williams calls loudly for solution. On 10 August, 1672, a licence was issued to a person of that name 'to be a Presbyterian preacher of Wrexham in Denbysh'[2]; on the same day and appearing on the same page in the *Entry Book* a Daniel Williams was given a licence similarly worded at Daventry in Northants.; on September 5 still another Daniel Williams is given another and analogous licence at Wicksham in Lancashire.[3] Lyon Turner makes all these to be one and the same man, a triangular theory which violates all the canons of common-sense.[4] He says also that the 'Wicksham' of the third licence was none other than Wickham Bishops in Essex. Fortunately this last dictum of his has the double defence of there being no place of the name 'Wicksham' in Lancashire and of a house belonging to a Robert Plume being licenced on the same day at Wickham in Essex. No Daniel Williams is associated by Calamy or by Palmer with either Daventry or Wickham as having been ejected between

1 It is certain that the fourth son of Morgan Llwyd was living at Portsmouth in 1683 (*Gweithiau*, ii, 315, n. 5).

2 *E.B.*, p. 235. Very curiously, this entry has been omitted altogether from the *Traethodydd* transcripts (Vol. lvi, examine p. 328), but the 'Wicksham' licence on p. 240 has been inserted.

3 *ib.*, p. 240.

4 *O.R.*, ii, 807, 935, 1198.

1660 and the end of 1662 ; of course, it is just possible that there might be settled at either or both a Dissenter of a younger school than the Bartolomeans. The writer's humble opinion is that the Williamses of Northants. and Essex were two different men, Williams of Wrexham yet another.

Was this Daniel Williams of Wrexham the later Dr. Daniel Williams, founder of the library in Gordon Square, profound theological writer and controversialist, the beneficent Welshman who by his will in 1711-1712 (putting some £50,000 in trust for pious purposes) gladdened the hearts of many a poor Dissenter in the country, and pushed forward immeasurably the cause of education in North Wales ? According to his epitaph, the Doctor was undoubtedly born at Wrexham in the county of Denbigh ; but even the third Calamy, who was so conversant with him, has practically nothing to say of his parentage or of his education. 'A primis annis pietate acque ac bonis literis feliciter imbutus' are the very non-commital words of the epitaph-maker.[1] In 1672, however, he was not at Wrexham but was acting as colleague to Samuel Marsden, a moderate Congregationalist, as pastor of the Wood Street congregation in Dublin. Alexander Gordon, probably the greatest living authority on the Doctor's career, is of opinion that he was at his native town in the summer of 1672, or was expected there on a visit.[2] If that indeed were so, did he preach at the house of Hugh Roberts his brother-in-law ? There is no evidence that Roberts was married to Williams' sister as early as this ; and if he were, his house did not have a licence. Or at the barn of John Hughes of Wrexham, licenced for Presbyterians since 13 May ?[3] In that case it is passing strange that Philip Henry, to whom Hughes and his house were very well known, has no reference to any Daniel Williams in his diaries for 1672. Nor does Calamy touch upon any Indulgence activities of Dr. Daniel Williams.

Any attempt to explain away the *Wrexham* of *E. B.*, p. 235, by saying it arose from a confusion of letters with *Wicksham* breaks down at two points : the two terms are

1 Calamy : *Continuation*, ii, 968, 981.
2 *Freedom after Ejection*, p. 384. The historian of Wrexham is quite silent on these points (A. N. Palmer : *Hist. Older Noncon. of Wrexham*, p. 47).
3 *E.B.*, p. 106. The "barn" is an inference from Henry's *Diaries* (p. 255). A. N. Palmer thinks John Hughes was a bookseller (*H.O.N.W.*, p. 48).

separated by four full pages of licence entries ; and Wrexham is definitely placed in 'Denbysh.' Daniel Williams the Presbyterian teacher of Wrexham must be accepted as part and parcel of humanity in August 1672. Beyond that the surviving evidence refuses to take us. That he was the later Dr. Daniel Williams is not yet established.

(iii) The Term Mis-applied.

The main reason for thus discussing the case of Daniel Williams in this particular chapter is because both Bate and Lyon Turner have decided to add him to the ranks of the *general* teachers.[1] This presumably because no house is mentioned in the record. The wording of the entry lends no warrant to such a conclusion, since it is impossible to interpret it as giving him permission to preach 'in *any* place licenced or allowed by Us.' Nor is he unequivocally put down as 'general teacher.' In fact, Bate is far too fond of extending the application of this form of indulgence. Simply because one of Arlington's clerks wrote Reginald Morgan of Bettws by Newport down as Presbyterian teacher and his house as a 'place' for Independents, and further forgot to say clearly that Morgan was to preach in his own house at all, he is called 'general' by Bate.[2] The truth is that if Morgan could not preach in his own house, then his licence did not give him leave to preach anywhere else. A David Williams received a licence to preach at Talgarth in Brecon, and the house of William Watkins in that same locality was also allowed as a 'place' *but with no definite association of teacher and house*[3] *:* David Williams is straightway described by Bate as a 'general' teacher.[4] Such a conclusion would not be safe even if it were clearly proved that the David Williams whose house was licenced at Llanfeugian[5] be one and the same person as the teacher of Talgarth. It would be a queer state of things indeed if David Williams of Llanfeugian could not *preach* in his own house, allowed the teacher Lewis Prytherch to do so, and went himself as far as Talgarth where he had a licence to preach, but no definite place to hold forth in. It is more natural to suppose

1 App. vii, p. lviii (Bate) : *O.R.*, ii, 1198.
2 App. vii, xl ; *E.B.*, cp. pp. 231, 245.
3 *E.B.*, p. 254.
4 App. vii, lvii.
5 *E.B.*, pp. 286, 287.

that David Williams of Talgarth had a personal licence to preach at the house of William Watkins (such disconnected entries are rather common in the last pages of the *Entry Book*). How can this supposition outlive the fact that the *Lay Subsidy Rolls* discover a David Williams living at Llanfeugian but *not* at Talgarth ?[1] For the simple reason that no one yet has credited the truncated *Subsidy Rolls* of the Restoration with giving complete information who was living in a particular parish at a particular time.

(iv) Religious Trespassers.

We must hasten to say that though in theory Bate is incorrect over the cases of Talgarth and the Newport Bettws, he may be very correctly describing the activities of these preachers in practice. For the evidence is unrebuttable that what with the fervour of the new freedom, what with the demoralisation of the praetorian guard who had been wont to inflict the penalties of the two Conventicle Acts, '*particular*' *licencees were everywhere becoming* '*general*' *teachers*, wandering far outside the bounds ' of the congregation allowed by Us.' The time has come to view from another angle Bishop Lucy's high indignation at the way Stephen Hughes conveniently forgot that his Llanstephan and Pencader licences were not general but particular, travelled far afield, and even intruded himself into churches (*churches*, be it noted) in the neighbourhood of his native town of Carmarthen.[2] In another letter the Bishop could only compare the licencees' lack of modesty (with his eye more particularly on Stephen Hughes) to Shimei's foolhardiness in leaving Jerusalem for Gath against the orders of King Solomon—' soe they will have noe bounds for themselves, but give them to others,' whatever the last disjunctive phrase might mean.[3] A Biblical scholar like Stephen, should he ever hear of this simile in the Bishop's letter to Sheldon, would not be slow to point out that Shimei *did* obey the king's injunctions for three years, and only then left the city on his fateful journey on what appear to be very justifiable grounds.[4]

Months before this, Timothy Halton, newly collated to

1 Rolls marked 219/63.
2 *Tanner MS.* 146, f. 138.
3 *ib.*, f. 113 (from Brecon, 20 Feb., 1672-1673).
4 I Kings, ii, 36-46 (especially verse 39).

the archdeaconry of Brecon,[1] was writing to Chief Secretary Williamson that the county of Brecon was well furnished with conventicles, '*and what troubles some persons is that several of those who are licenced are excommunicated by the Church of England, and yet venture to administer the sacraments.*' Did not the 'some persons' include the good archdeacon himself? Writing as he was in June, as not a single licence came to that county before September, and only three teachers' licences altogether, he must be accused of being somewhat hazy in his facts[2]; indeed, the general tenor of the letter—with its reference to the Oxford 'Act' of July, Halton's own intention of going up for it, and the kindness Sir Joseph would do by sending the proctor a piece of venison for its due celebration—all bespeak a cultured don who was glad to forsake the problems of Brycheiniog for the fleshpots of Oxford, a well-fed Englishman upon whom the cares of the Church at this crisis in her fortunes sat very lightly. Of the unlicenced liberty flourishing under the six sections of the Declaration of March this letter of the archdeacon's is of prime importance. It would be interesting to know what the architect of the Indulgence and the virtual dispenser of its licences thought of it all. Would it surprise the King overmuch to hear that preachers in the diocese of St. David's *with no licences to show* were boldly saying in justification of their continued preaching that they had 'greate freinds in Court'?[3] Men with no licences preaching at all, men with restricted licences preaching unrestrictedly—these were sad spectacles to the Bishop, whatever about the King and the Archdeacon of Brecon.

Moving up north, what tale does the following table tell of the attitude of Philip Henry, licenced on 30 April to preach at his own house of Broad Oak, and at no other place? The widest implication of that licence, the most generous drafting of the bounds of his Presbyterian congregation, would only allow him to preach to such Presbyterians as foregathered at Hanmer and Bryn and Wrexham. These three places boasted five Presbyterian licences between them. In the

1 8 Feb., 1671-1672 (*First Fruits Certifs.*, St. David's, File 15). Halton and Williamson were both Queen's College men. In 1677 the former became himself Provost of Queen's.

2 The letter was written from Brecon on 24 *June*, 1672 (*St. Pap. Dom.*, Chas. II., 312, No. 1).

3 Bishop Lucy's statement (*Tanner MS.* 146, f. 138v).

official eye Philip Henry was not associated with any of the five.

Date	*Venue of Preaching.*	*Date of Licences (if any).*	*No. of page in Diaries.*
24 June, 1672	*Marton in Salop* ..	*Licenced for Congs. only, 22 May, E.B., 134.*	*253*
3 July, 1672	*Wrexham—house of John Hughes.*	*Licenced for Presbs., 13 May, ib., 106.*	*254*
31 July, 1672	*Do. do.* ..	*Do. do.* ..	*254*
8 Aug., 1672	*Whitchurch—house of Thos. Yates.*	*Licenced for Presbs., 16 June, ib., 186.*	*255*
18 Sept., 1672	*Marton in Salop* ..	*See above*	*256*
1 Oct., 1672	*Drayton—house of John Cox.*	*Licenced for Presbs., 5 Sept., ib., 244.*	*256*
1 Jan., 1672-3	*Moston—house of John Lawrence.*	*No licence*	*260*
14 Jan., 1672-3	*Sweeney—house of Thos. Baker.*	*Licenced for Congs. only, 25 July, ib., 218.*	*260*
22 Jan., 1672-3	*Wrexham—house not specified.*	..	*260*
9 Feb., 1672-3	*Petton—house not specified.*	*No licence*	*261*
14 Feb., 1672-3	*Wrexham (fast)—house not specified.*	..	*261*

Thus Henry was guilty of exceeding the terms of his licence by going outside the bounds of his own 'perswasion' at least twice, by preaching in one house (that of Yates at Whitchurch) for which another Presbyterian held a licence, and in at least two places which never received a licence at all.

What fugitive references there are preserved in Calamy's works concerning these days of the Indulgence point very much the same moral. If Francis Keeling, a Presbyterian friend of Henry's who drew out a general licence on 16 May, preached at Wrexham once a month, and if that was done at the house of the aforesaid John Hughes, nothing could be said in charge.[1] Not so in the case of the Presbyterian Richard Goodwin of Bolton, only licenced for the house of John Okey in that town, who was found as far afield as the house of Hughes at Wrexham on the morning and evening of 31 July.[2] And what of Joseph Oddy, whose only licence to preach was connected with the house of John Hall in the

1 *E.B.*, p. 115; *Continuation*, ii, 725
2 *ib.*, p. 132; *Diaries*, pp. 254-255

town of Cambridge in Bridge Street, if he became a sort of itinerant preacher in the Isle of Ely, and administered the Sacrament every Lord's Day to one congregation or another ?[1] Of Henry Oasland of Bewdley, licenced for his own house and one other, who travelled to preach in four counties ?[2] Of Oliver Heywood, licenced at two houses in Halifax, who preached at three or four other centres, 'and many other places' ?[3] John Salkeld was preaching at Walsham in Suffolk a full week before a permit to do so was granted by the authorities.[4] And Calamy is not the only witness. Anthony Wood had no love for 'Tom Pun' (the antiquary's euphonious pseudonym for Thomas Gilbert, B.D., that chief epitaph-maker of the Dissenters who was also a good hand at making puns), and delights in saying that the fanatics were brisk in Oxford, especially in Gilbert's house, as early as March—this although the punster did not get his general licence issued in London before the last day of April.[5] Finally, John Bunyan was on the 6th October preaching at Leicester, although his 'particular' licence only allowed him to preach to his Bedford congregation at the barn of Josias Roughead.[6] There is no wonder that the Bishop of Lincoln about this time was asking in despair whether those licenced for one place could preach in another licenced place.[7] Yet by September even a bishop ought to have made himself acquainted with licence forms, general and particular.

To return from these distant districts to the immediate borders of Wales, let us examine the record of Henry Maurice, the Lleyn Puritan who said farewell to his chequered fortunes as a conformist by resigning the living of Church Stretton in 1671.[8] Less than a year after this came the Indulgence, under which he took out three licences, one to preach at his own house in Much Wenlock, another at the house of Edward King at the same place, a third at the house of Edmund Symonds in Acton Round. And there cannot be much doubt

1 *E.B.*, p. 81; *Continuation*, i, 122-123.
2 *ib.*, pp. 215, 217, 258; *Continuation*, ii, 887.
3 *ib.*, pp. 35, 214; *Acct.*, ii, 807.
4 *ib.*, p. 49; *Continuation*, ii, 786. According to Calamy, that sermon in praise of the Indulgence was preached on *23 April, 1673*. It is improbable that such a sermon would be delivered nearly seven weeks *after* the Declaration *was cancelled*. 1673 must be a misprint for 1672.
5 *ib.*, p. 50; cp. with *Life and Times* of Wood, ii, 244.
6 Dr. John Brown: *Life* (1885), p. 233; for Bunyan's wide activities at this period, see *ib.*, pp. 249-250. But see *supra*, p. 84 (n. 2).
7 *C.S.P.*, 1672, p. 589 (7 Sept.)—Bishop to Williamson.
8 *Supra*, p. 26.

that he was the teacher expected to visit the house of Widow Sankey in his old pastorate of Stretton. The licence for her house was granted on 25 July.[1] About three weeks *before* that (on 2 July) Maurice had paid a call at the widow's house, a call well proclaimed beforehand, to find many of his old friends and neighbours assembled there, 'yea, many of them that wretchedly reviled me when I quitted my place [as Anglican cleric].' He preached to them from Luke xix, 42. So Maurice had preached at Widow Sankey's house nearly three weeks before he had his own 'personal' licence on 25 July, and nearly three weeks before her house was permitted to hold meetings at all.

A prominent jurist of our time has put it that a man of average morality will hesitate at defrauding an individual, hesitate less at defrauding a railway company or a club, not at all about cheating the State, if he can do so with impunity.[2] The school of Philip Henry and Henry Maurice seems inevitably to fall within the third category. Perhaps a deeper appreciation of the events that followed 1660 will rather lead one to say that they christianised an old Roman maxim and made the salvation of souls the supremest law. How could Henry be dumb before an 'incouraging Auditory'[3] and Maurice deny the 'enlargement' of mind and speech that came to him after much earnest prayer? A little over three years before this a counsel of the Crown, arguing at the Court of Common Pleas that Vavasor Powell should not be allowed to go out on bail, had exclaimed "No, my Lord, then he will go preach."[4] It was this Puritan passion for preaching which drove a high-horsed chariot across the thin barriers of the Declaration. As a register of this startling reassertion of the old Puritan enthusiasm the detailed chronicles of Philip Henry are overshadowed by the little diary of Henry Maurice.[5]

1 For all these licences, see *E.B.*, pp. 210, 243.
2 Edward Jenks: *Law and Politics in the Middle Ages*, p. 70.
3 *Diaries*, p. 256.
4 *Life* (1671), p. 188.
5 This has been printed almost verbatim by Dr. Thos. Rees in his *History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales* (1883 edn., pp. 212-220). It would be very interesting to know the present whereabouts of the original.

NOTE: JONES MS. 22 (supra, p. 118).

This document, a transcript of the licence entries in *E.B.*, takes its name from a Henry Jones who was rector of Sunningwell in Berkshire until 1700. Being a Non-juror he resigned that position, but was readmitted to the living in 1706. He died about October 1707. Jones happened to be nephew to Bishop John Fell (d. in 1686), and to him as co-heir came many of that bishop's MSS. At his death he bequeathed to the Bodleian Library sixty volumes of MSS., very miscellaneous in character, dealing chiefly with the 16th and 17th centuries (W. D. Macray: *Annals of the Bodleian* (1890) p. 177). In the catalogue of the *Western MSS.* in the Bodleian (vol. iii), the Jones bequest ranges from No. 8908 to 8968. Whether it was the rector or the bishop who actually made these transcripts, he did his work very poorly. The spelling far out-does that of the London clerks in atrocity: *Undy* in Monmouth is down as *Nudly* (f. 83). Besides, some of the folios are badly torn. That applies to ff. 100, 101, on which some important Welsh entries had been written.

XIII.

THE DIARY OF HENRY MAURICE.[1]

(i) Liberty or Licence?

In the month preceding Maurice's meeting at the Widow Sankey's at Stretton he had made a journey to John Kynaston's house at Bryngwyn in Montgomery and to that of Ann King at Llanbister in Radnor. There is no direct evidence of his having preached at either place; rather does he devote his account to a pious conversation he had in Montgomeryshire with a woman hailing from the Salop parish of Westbury,[2] and to the spectacle of a boy barefooted and bare-legged he met upon the highlands of Radnor. If he did preach, and the likelihood is very great, Kynaston's house was not licenced for weeks afterwards nor that of Mrs. King for five months. Evidence also exists, more especially a conservation he had with Kynaston about the attitude of the Bishop of Bangor,[3] to prove that he came down again to those parts about the middle of July. Early in August Maurice is found riding out once more to visit Dissenting houses in Radnor and Brecon. At the end of that month he and his wife wended their way from Shrewsbury to their native Lleyn. The following table (even at the risk of some little repetition) gives in summary the incidents of the three journeys.

1 In the *Cofiadur* for 1928 the present writer has already endeavoured to analyse the attitude and activities of Maurice during the Indulgence period, but from a somewhat different angle (see chapters vi-x).

2 Perhaps she was one of the 4 Nonconformists found in that parish four years later (*Salt MS.*, f. 202—census of 1676).

3 Undoubtedly Dr. Robert Morgan, second Restoration Bishop of that diocese. Though he lived but little after this date, his successor (Dr. Humphrey Lloyd) was not consecrated till Nov. 1673 (Wood's *Life and Times*, ii. 273).

Dates.	*Events.*	*Date of licences issued to teachers or to houses visited.*
June 1, 1672	*Set out for Bryngwyn ; house of John Kynaston.*	*25 July (E.B., p. 210).*
,, 17, 1672	*Arrived at Ann King's house in Llanbister.*	*18 Nov. (ib., p. 273).*
,, 18, 1672	*Conversation with Mrs. King about the clergyman Lloyd.*	..
July 20, 1672	*Kynaston tells him of the Bishop of Bangor's reproaches regarding his early life (Maurice's).*	..
Aug. 5, 1672	*Arrived at Capt. Watkins' house [in Llanigon] accompanied by John Hanmer ; no definite evidence of preaching.*	*30 Sept. (ib., p. 254).*
,, 7, 1672	*Rode to Gwernyfed, thence to Talgarth, preached from Ezek. xvi, 6. Returned to Gwernyfed ; talk with Chas. Lloyd.*	*30 Sept. (ib., p. 254.*
,, 8, 1672	*Came to Glasgwm in Radnor, preached from Rev. iii, 20, at a house not specified ; rode to Hanmer's house in Llanbister.*	*18 Nov. (ib., p. 273). [2 houses].*
August 27 to 1 Sept.	*Preached at Gunley near Newtown* ..	*18 Nov. (ib., p. 269).*
	Llanbrynmair	*No licence recorded.*
	Machynlleth	*No licence recorded.*
	Bronyclydwr (house of Hugh Owen).	*22 May (E.B., p. 135).*
3 Sept. ..	*Arrived at Pwllheli ; preached at William Griffith's house from Rev. iii, 20 ; 'there were many to hear.'*	*No licence recorded.*
4 Sept. ..	*Visit to Gwynfryn, the home of his wife's people.*	..
5 Sept. ..	*Came to Nanhoron in the evening.*	..
6 Sept. ..	*Rode from Nanhoron to his old home at Methlan.*	..
7 Sept. ..	*Visited his cousin John Williams, 'the apostle of Lleyn,' at Ty nycoed by Llangian ; in the evening came back to Pwllheli.*	.. ..
8 Sept. ..	*Sabbath ; was refused 'the liberty of the public place' [parish church] ; preached at William Griffith's house from Jeremiah xxx, 21, 22.*	..
9 Sept. ..	*Visited his brother (name and place not given) ; preached there from John xv, 13.*	*No licence recorded.*
10 Sept. ..	*Went with sister Elin to Trygarn.*	..
11 Sept. ..	*Came to Gwynfryn ; taught in the evening in Pwllheli at the house of Maurice Jones' widow from Cant. ii, 13.*	*No licence recorded.*
12 Sept. ..	*At Pwllheli in the evening ; prayed with the family of Hugh Evans.*	..

Dates.	*Events.*	*Date of Licences issued to Teachers or to Houses visited.*
13 Sept. ..	*Fair day at Pwllheli ; 'occasion to speak with several' ; discourse with Hugh Evans and Richard Thomas at the latter's house.*	..
14 Sept. ..	*Second visit to his cousin John Williams; no sermon referred to.*	..
15 Sept. ..	*Sabbath ; in the morning preached at the widow Jones' house from I Pet. iv, 18 ; visit to Llanarmon in the afternoon ; refused leave to preach in parish church ; preached in yard from 1 Pet. iv, 18 ; by the evening returned to Pwllheli, sermon from Romans v, 8.*	..
16 Sept. ..	*Starts on return journey ; arrives at Cynfal and preaches there.*	*22 July (E.B., p. 201).*

Thus he preached at *five* places for which no licence was ever recorded at all, at *three* where the licences were not issued at the time of his preaching there, at *two* for which licences were already granted, but not with Maurice as associated teacher. Whatever the reasons which kept him from visiting the South Caernarvon houses of John and William Rowlands and Bodvel House near Llannor, it is very sure these did *not* arise from the fact that the licences for these houses had not arrived from London (they were only written out at Whitehall on 5 September[1]). Much more mysterious is his failure, as far as the diary relates, to deliver sermons at either of his two visits to his preacher cousin at Ty'nycoed : there he consoled himself with lecturing the 'apostle of Lleyn' for his supposed indifference and lethargy in the work of the Gospel. With these unconvincing exceptions, it looks as if Maurice and most of his hearers had completely forgotten certain words in sec. 4 of the Declaration—'that none of our subjects do presume to meet in any place until such place be allowed, and the teacher of that congregation be approved by Us.'

He went far also in disturbing the spirit of that section which laid a stern ban on the holding of any benefice by any one who was not 'exactly conformable' : for did he not seek permission to preach in the parish church of Pwllheli on the

1 *E.B.*, p. 238.

Sabbath of September 8, and make a bold effort to hold forth in the church of Llanarmon just a week later? On the first occasion, it is true, he had some fears of imprisonment; after the Llanarmon refusal he immediately preached to an assembly in the churchyard, 'though with much restraint upon my spirit.' On his way through Brecknock in June Maurice had an earnest discourse with one of his friends about 'going to public': his attitude in Lleyn proves pretty conclusively that under the ægis of the Indulgence he hoped to see Dissenters again boldly entering into the public churches as in the old days of Triers and Trustees. But if Higgs had been refused a licence to preach in a school-house at Swansea, there was little hope of Maurice being allowed to preach in the consecrated church of Llannordineio.

(ii) 'Enlargement of Spirit.'

Apart from the questionable propriety of thus tampering with the letter and spirit of the Declaration, the little diary bears ample witness to the transformation of a double-dyed conformist into a stout-hearted Puritan, and to a spiritual hearkening back to the outlook which had made the Triers appoint him as Puritan 'curate' of Llannordineio in 1658.[1] Here are found agonised wrestlings of soul akin to those of Vavasor Powell in his earlier years[2]; the perambulation of Pwllheli fair much as Morgan Llwyd, according to a tradition preserved by Robert Jones Rhoslan, had done some years before[3]; the same exact observance of secret prayer and family devotions that was so characteristic of his contemporary Philip Henry; the same giving of thanks to the Lord at the close of many of his daily entries; and besides the renewing of his 'covenant' on the Sabbath, he had a practice of offering weekly thanksgiving on the *Saturday* which the Puritan of English Flint does not seem to have included among his many virtues. All forms of prayer he knew of and assiduously practised—prayer with his wife, 'praying in private after,' praying in a wood near Trygarn, praying by night in a secret place near his old home of Methlan, praying 'in a neighbouring wood' by Mrs. King's house in Radnor.

1 *Lambeth Augn. Book* 995, f. 229.
2 *Life* (1671), pp. 3-9.
3 *Drych yr Amseroedd* (*Llenor* ed. of 1898), p. 23.

Quite in the Puritan manner are his prayers for the unregenerate members of his own family and for the town of Pwllheli (' with much brokenness '), the morbid memories of the gay and reckless days of his youth, ' the discouragement at finding little or nothing of God appearing in any of these parts,' the rebukes to his cousin John Williams for the silence that persecution had forced him unto, for the temptation to sit still that the times had laid upon that apostle. He was also something troubled at the neglect of family devotions at Llanigon and Gwernyfed. Himself he does not spare: oft does he speak of his dry spirit, of his temptation ' to speak to men and not to God,' of a tendency in his native haunts to comply with the spirits of carnal men (his old companions, it may be); once even he admits a tendency to sleep, and that during private prayer; nor were the perils of atheism altogether non-existent.

And alternating with these pangs of pessimism come freedom, refreshment, enlargement (favourite words of his). Throughout all breathes the undoubted sincerity of a great Christian man. A worldly hypocrite would assuredly not have entered in his diary the rejoinder made by his cousin Williams at the second visit of September 14 to the renewed attack made by Maurice upon the former's indifference to the preaching of the Word. ' He told me something of the sense that many in that country had about my quitting my benefice, that it was done only out of some politic design. He told me also that I must walk very close and upright to recover my credit in that country.' Williams was referring, without much doubt, to the failure of Maurice in 1661[1] to appear at the rectory of Meyllteyrn and its chapel of Bottwnog because of the preferment secured across the Border, a proceeding which led to the charge of ' non-residence ' being brought against him by Bishop William Roberts of Bangor.[2] Sitting still, Williams must have thought, was not worse than ' non-residence,' and politic design quite as reprehensible as

1 This date is supported by a very interesting letter written by him on 27 Dec., 1661, from over the Border in the bishopric of Hereford ' ffor my Deare Mr. Maurice Gruffydd att his housqueere Bodferyn in ilûn [Lleyn]' (*N.L.W.MS.* 3071, 149—formerly *Mostyn MS.* 237). It was only on 8 *Apr.*, 1661 he had been admitted to Meyllteyrn by the Bishop (*First Fruits Certs.*, Bangor, File 1). Very curiously Maurice had about three weeks previous been admitted to the vicarage of Bromfield in Salop (*First Fruits Certifs.*, Hereford. File 11).

2 See entry on *First Fruits Certifs.*, Bangor, File 1, opposite 6 March, 1662-1663, when a new rector named Griffith Roberts was admitted there.

silence wrought by Carnarvonshire sheriffs. Or was Williams referring to Maurice's more recent abandonment of the rectory of Church Stretton ? In any case, the diary says, the general discussion on that September day brought tears to the eyes of both.

(iii) A Divided Family.

The diary gives poignant proofs of the afflictions brought upon family ties by the religious problems of the day. At this point it must be clearly put that the house of Methlan near Aberdaron (Henry was the youngest son of Griffith Maurice of Methlan) was closely interwoven with the established order in Church and State.[1] Griffith's wife was Mary sister of Thomas Wynn of Boduan, who in turn was bosom friend to the fire-eating Cavalier Colonel John Bodvel who had his home close by ; a bishop and a rector had married into the family ; and did not Susan, Henry's niece, become the wife of Ellis Parry, admitted vicar of Aberdaron on 28 October, 1671 ?[2] Perhaps it was this assemblage of squires and clerics that led the learned compiler of the pedigree to devise a sad isolation for Henry as *Harri Morris the Preacher*. Two days after Maurice arrived in Pwllheli, his father sent him a letter ' which did much trouble and discompose me,' driving the diarist to contrast the Lord's encouragement from within and man's discouragement without ; five days after that he had some ' jangling ' with his mother (probably over the same questions) which fortunately ended in peace.

But *Harri Morris* was not quite so isolated in his own family as the table makes him out to be. Neither the parish of Aberdaron nor the house of Methlan had escaped the Puritan impact. The visit to Llanarmon arose from the invitation of a brother, either Frederic or Morris (usually known as Morris Griffith). Of the former it is only known he died without issue ; and as yet the links are not quite strong enough to equate the Morris Griffith who had to hand over three cases of pistols to the authorities in 1661[3] with the Carnarvonshire J.P. of that name who died on his way

1 J. E. Griffith : *Pedigrees of Angl. and Carn. Families* (1914), p. 271 ; also *N.L.W. Add. MS.* 1511 E f. 104 (Kinmel Collection).
2 *Certifs.*, Bangor, File 3.
3 *N.L.W. MS.* 3071, ff. 70, 117.

to Ludlow in 1687[1] (the pistols would prove him a dangerous republican, the magistrate's office would show him a compromiser with the powers that were). His sister Elin, married to John Griffith of Gwyddelen by Llangwnadl, in a seemingly friendly manner accompanied him and his wife on 10 September from Methlan to Trygarn ; and a cousin named Lowry Williams listened so to his sermon from the Canticles at Pwllheli that Maurice cherished the hope 'she minds the best things.' Cousin John was the 'apostle.' And Richard Edwards of Nanhoron was related to him (though indirectly) through the former's marriage with Ann Wynn, niece to Thomas Wynn of Boduan.[2] Ann Edwards was therefore his first cousin.

Most important in completing this cycle of sympathy came Maurice's devoted wife Elin, the daughter of Jeffrey Glynne of Gwynfryn by Pwllheli. How these Glynnes regarded the unorthodox practices of Dissenters can be gauged from the diarist's curious statement that he was 'prevented from seeking the Lord in the garden there' on the 11 September, either in private prayer or public sermon. Notwithstanding these discouragements, Elin Maurice stood steadfast to her husband's new gospel, and after his death took as her second mate Daniel Phillips of Pwllheli, that new leader from the South who was to guide the Puritans of Lleyn until the days of the Toleration Act.[3] Her importance as a factor in the fortunes of Welsh dissent is only comparable to that of Katharine, the widow of Vavasor Powell.

(iv) With the Gunmen.

Equally interesting are the occasional allusions to the emotional havoc caused in the peninsula of Lleyn by the penal code. 'I found the Christians thereabouts very fearful,' he says on September 11, 'so that they came together very late in the night.' Yet he confesses that many flocked to hear him the first evening he reached Pwllheli from Penmorfa.

This visit of his must have acted as a wonderful tonic to

1 J. E. Griffith : *Pedigrees*, p. 271. It is well to say that in a list of the county J.P.'s (Nov.-Dec., 1687) his name does not appear (*Rawlinson MS.* A. 139A, f. 160). But it *does* appear as 'Maurice Griffith Esqr' in a new list of James II's county magistrates which was published at the beginning of 1688 (*ib.*, f. 140). This does not agree very well with the Ludlow story.

2 *N.L.W. MS.* 1511 E, cp. ff. 53, 104.

3 *Gordon MS.*, ff. 92, 98. He ministered there till his death in 1722.

the nerves of the nonconformist brotherhood, as two of the householders who gave him hospitality in 1672 and two others who received licences about this time were present at the Llangybi conventicle which was broken up in April 1676, not without 'effusion of blood' on the part of those sent to apprehend them.[1] Most probably the Pwllheli widow was once the wife of that Morris Jones of Llangybi who had to hand over two cases of pistols in 1661 and was committed to the 'marshall' at Caernarvon at the beginning of 1662. William Griffith of Pwllheli, at whose house he first preached on this visit, had also been in the same marshal's custody in the fateful year 1662. And it requires but a very modest flight of imagination to see present in the churchyard crowd at Llanarmon Cadwaladr Jones of Derwyn and Humphrey Roberts of Llanaelhaiarn, two other gentlemen who between them had to unload several cases of pistols in the days following the Restoration. Such were the militant men who now hung at the words of the erstwhile conformist.[2]

In this context what a pity it is that Maurice did not write in his diary some notes of the conversation he had with Richard Edwards of Nanhoron on that evening of September 5! It would be impolitic to describe Edwards as a member of the spiritual vanguard of Puritanism when the movement enjoyed pride of power; but the *Mostyn MSS.* bear witness how odious this Parliament man was to the Cavalier bucks of the country just after the Restoration, and the State Papers prove him so staunch to his old friends as to visit Vavasor Powell in the Fleet prison about the Christmastide of 1660.[3] Twenty-seven years after that Edwards was still alive, still a Dissenter, qualified to be a J.P., but debarred by his religious opinions from being in the commission.[4] On that evening in September 1672 all Maurice has to say is—'we prayed in private there with some refreshment and encouragement.' That interview boded well for the continued adherence of Richard Edwards to the Puritan faith. Needless to say, before the coming of the

1 *N.L.W. MS.* 3072E, 10 (formerly *Mostyn MS.* 238).

2 For all these 'pistol' cases and proceedings at Caernarvon, see *N.L.W. MS.* 3071, ff. 70, 71, 117. No less than three distinct men of the name William Griffith figure in these records. A William Griffith was mentioned by Maurice in his letter of December, 1661, as a likely person to help with the payment of a certain debt. He might have been William Griffith of Pwllheli.

3 *C.S.P.*, 1660-1661, pp. 423-4, 484.

4 *Rawlinson MS.* A. 139a, cp. ff. 140, 160.

Militia Acts, his house was well stocked with efficient pistols. The Sheriff's emissaries were particularly inquisitive in the neighbourhood of Nanhoron.

Gunmen, and those who associate with them, are in these our days exponents of a very aggressive nationalism. And it can be said that these gunmen of Lleyn were Welshmen almost to a man. Though the term 'nationalist' would be far too modern to suit the times of Maurice, he also was a worthy son of Wales, a full-blooded Welshman. For besides infusing new vigour into the Lleyn Dissenters neglected of late by his cousin of Ty'nycoed, he brought from over the Border a breeze of true Cymric patriotism into a land which had suffered both from the administration of the great Puritan committees and from the appointment of Restoration bishops like William Lucy and Henry Glemham: with evident relish does he enter in his diary that it was in the native tongue he prayed in the family of Capt. Watkins at Llanigon, and that both the praying and preaching at Talgarth were 'all in Welsh.' The freedom and enlargement he enjoyed in this work were very natural to a man who, fourteen years before, had strengthened Stephen Hughes' edition of Vicar Prichard's work by adding marginal notes for the benefit of readers in North Wales.[1] It is indeed refreshing to hear during the days of the Indulgence the voice of a true Welshman, to contrast him with Erbery the Seeker and Holmes the Quaker who had once thundered out their strange doctrines in English to Welsh ears. To such a man it would be galling to think that a Philistine named Randolph was enjoying the fruits of that rectory of Meyllteyrn which he had forsaken in 1661. It is not on record what he thought of cousin John bringing an English wife into the recesses of Lleyn.[2]

(v) The Conformable Clergy.

There are references in the diary to persons of note, both Puritan and Anglican, which serve to enrich and vivify the dry records of this dark time. As for licences under the Indulgence they will receive some notice in the next two chapters. For the moment, and before discussing the clerical names, something must be said of a

1 See last page, 'At y Darlleydd,' signed H.M.; *Bible in Wales*, p. 33; *Seren Gomer*, Jan. 1902, pp. 48-49.

2 J. E. Griffith: *Pedigrees*, p. 194. John Williams married Dorothy, daughter of Randolph Whalley of Davenham in Cheshire.

Dissenter who presumably had no desire to trouble the officials at Whitehall.

It is just possible that the Charles Lloyd with whom Maurice discussed the propriety of 'going to public' was that Charles Lloyd who was one of the panel of authors who compiled the *Examen Vavasoris* in 1654, Puritan rector of Llanfyllin from 1654 to 1660,[1] an interest which he had to surrender by the restoration of the former Anglican incumbent under the Act of September. Was he the Charles Lloyd who reappears in 1675 as one of the elders of the gathered church of Brecknock, and that in the letter penned by Maurice himself ?[2] However, remembering that the discourse took place at Gwernyfed, it is far more probable that the elder of 1675 and the squire of 1672 was no other than the person of that name, described as 'Charles Lloyd, of Gwernyfed, gentleman,' who was down in the will of Rice Powell of Boughrood as one of the trustees of the munificent Boughrood Charity.[3] This probability is made to approach very near certainty when we find the term 'Dissenter' placed opposite his name at the end of 1687.[4]

Next, a curate and a bishop. The person who got the blame for preventing Maurice to preach in the parish church of Pwllheli, where he had ministered from 1658 to 1660, was Richard Owen, presumably Anglican successor to the curate Edward Jones found there by the Parliamentary surveyors of 1649, and passing rich on a similar maintenance of £20 a year. Instead of the £60 assigned to Maurice by the Puritan Trustees for Maintenance of Ministers 'to and for the increase' of the aforesaid £20.[5] The rectory of Llannordineio, together with those of Caerhun and Llandegai, had been of old annexed to the archdeaconry of Bangor, and that archdeaconry since October 1669 was held 'in commendam' by the Bishop, Dr. Robert Morgan.[6] It would be a subject of unpleasant comment in Anglican circles if the curate would allow a former Puritan minister of the parish who had so handsomely benefited from the downfall

1 *Lambeth Augm. Book* 997, ii, 145.
2 *Broadmead Records*, ed. Underhill, Add. B, p. 512.
3 Edwin Poole: *Hist. Breck. Charities* (1880), pp. 4-6.
4 *Rawlinson MS.* A. 139a, f. 155.
5 *Lambeth MS.* 902, f. 62; *Augm. Bk.* 995, f. 229. According to the information given to these surveyors, £60 p.a. was the total value of the 'tythes and spirituall profits belonging to the Rectory.'
6 *First Fruits Certifs.*, Bangor, File 2.

of the episcopal system to preach publicly in a church the official rector of which was no other than the Bishop himself. A Bishop too, as Maurice was told by John Kynaston in Montgomery, who seemed very well informed regarding the early indiscretions of that particular minister. [In brackets one may wonder whether Bishop Morgan and his informers could say whether Maurice of the diary was the scholar of Jesus of that name who had to bend the knee in full Congregation on 1 April, 1658, he having refused to go to Bocardo when ordered to do so. There is hardly any doubt that Henry Maurice was at Oxford and at Jesus during the Puritan period[1]].

Little as Maurice loved the Quakers, he calls the Llanarmon cleric ' who shut the public place against us ' by the Friendly term of ' priest.' This latter again must have been a curate, as it is in the highest degree unlikely that this Eifionydd chapelry or even the mother church of Llangybi itself was often visited on the Sabbath day by Edward Payne, the S.T.P. [Doctor of Divinity] who was admitted rector there on 29 May, 1662.[2]

In a conversation Maurice had with Ann King of Llanbister, reference was made to a clergyman of the name *Mr. Lloyd* who led a life not above reproach. He must be found either in the Evan Lloyd who became rector of Gladestry in September 1664 or in the Charles Lloyd who had been presented under the Great Seal to the rectory of Bleddfa in August 1660, and to that of Cascob in addition at the end of 1664.[3] The latter is far the more interesting character of the two ; fortunately also, Bleddfa is much nearer to Llanbister than Gladestry, and the character of its rector more likely to be known to Mrs. King. There is no contemporary record which supports this unfavourable estimate of the Bleddfa rector in 1672 ; but the Exchequer records of about ten years later make a John James of Bleddfa roundly depose that his rector in divers ways had not done his duty

1 *Reg. Congregation QA*, f. 68v ; *Matric. Book W* f. 458v—admitted 1651.

2 *Certifs.*, Bangor, File 1. It is almost certain, in the light of a remark in Archdcn. D. R. Thomas : *Hist. Dioc. St. Asaph*, 1913 ed., i, 356-357, that the ' Payne ' of the text is a misreading of ' *Wynne.*' Dr. Edward Wynne died at the end of 1669. His successor might have been the Thomas Davies who was parson there in 1682 (*Tanner MS.* 35, f. 119).

3 *Certifs.*, St. David's, File 13, and *Pat. Rolls*. 16 Chas. II. pt. 19. No. 1/51 (Evan Lloyd). For the promotions of Charles, see *P.R.*, Chas. II, pt. 1, No. 284, and *Certifs.*, File 14.

as parson, '*for he has been complained of in the Consistory court of St. David's for not doing so.*'[1] John James was himself accused by Charles Lloyd of not paying his tithes (which he denied); he very much looks like being the same John James who was 'elder' in the Bapto-Independent church of Radnorshire which Maurice sometimes visited 'to dispense the order of the Gospel amongst them' before and after 1675.[2] With all his faults Charles was a stout Protestant: there is nothing more piquant in the whole vast range of the *Tanner MSS.* than his public interjection of *as yett* into the public prayers for James II as Defender of the Faith.[3]

Thus this section has almost resolved itself into a disquisition on three Charles Lloyds: the one a Vavasorian apologist, the second a Dissenting squire, the third a somewhat notorious Anglican rector. Each one must be carefully kept distinct from Charles Lloyd, the gallant Quaker of Dolobran in Montgomery. Whether one of the first two is to be equated with the Charles Lloyd who paid a tax on four hearths in the parish of Llangammarch[4] is a question which cannot be answered with our present evidence. With one of them only it is known for certain Maurice came into close contact. His orthodox Puritanism would never appreciate the Quaker's vision. He and the rector of Bleddfa would probably give each other a wide berth.

(vi) Settlement in the South.

Though the pages of the little diary are now at an end, the last lap in this great preacher's career has still to be registered. It is quite an important episode in the story of the Indulgence. By the end of September 1672—bearing with him a piquant report of impertinent curates, non-resident rectors and others of unholy pattern, impressed by the tenacious memory of certain bishops, well-satisfied (let us hope) with the spiritual impetus he had given to wavering Puritan souls in Lleyn and Eifionydd—Maurice was back on the Border. Not for long. His two visits south of the Severn earlier in the year had created such a warmth of feeling in his hearers that it caused

1 *Exchequer Bills and Answers*, Radnor, No. 66, Hilary, 34-35 Charles II; No. 10, Easter, 36 Chas. II; No. 60, Hilary, 36-37 Chas. II (a protracted case).
2 *Broadmead Recs.*, Add. B, p. 518.
3 *Tanner MS.* 31, f. 123—Bp. Laurence Womack to Archbp. Sancroft from Abergwili, letter dated 27 June, *1685*.
4 *Lay Subsidy Rolls* (Hearth Tax), 219/63 (hundred of Builth).

his migration from Much Wenlock to the highlands of the Wye and Usk. Here for the next ten years he was to be settled pastor of the gathered church of Bapto-Independents 'which commonly meets at Llanigon.'[1]

The exact date of that exodus is not known. It is certain that the period of the Indulgence passed by without his receiving any further licence to meet the needs of his new congregation. Indeed, in face of the wide latitude for preaching allowed him by the exigencies of the time and by the apparent impotence of the Anglican authorities, such an additional licence was superfluous in practice though demanded by theory: and it is not a bit surprising to find the Bishop of St. David's writing in this strain to the Archbishop early in 1673: '*there is also one Morrice who* (*as I can learne*) *has noe licence* [i.e. for any place in this diocese], *a teacher errant, who leades a body of* 200 *or* 300 *after him in the face of this Country, having the last weeke preached heire neere this town* [of Brecon], *not at all checked or disturbed by the Justices of the peace.*'[2] The peculiarity of the spelling 'Morrice' and the fact that no other Dissenting preacher of that name is known to the records of Brecknock at this time, point pretty significantly to the old Border conformist Henry Maurice. At last a man had arrived in Brycheiniog big enough to fill the vacuum caused by the departure of Jenkin Jones from Llanthetty.

Two years after this report of the bishop's Maurice was chosen by Elder Terrill of Broadmead to summarise the state of Dissent in the whole principality. A year after that the census of 1676 was to prove Brecknock to have more 'sectaries' in it than the nonconforming county of Monmouth. At the same time Maurice did not forget his old haunts in the North, and prevailed upon James Owen of Abernant in Carmarthen to go up to superintend the Independents of Lleyn and Eifionydd, a crusade which brought that South Walian into contact with the Sheriff of Caernarvon at the Llangybi conventicle, and (at a later period) with Bishop William Lloyd in the famous debate at the Oswestry town hall.

Whether as preacher to the people or as the inspirer of other workers, there are few names in the annals of Welsh

1 *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 512.
2 *Tanner MS.* 146, f. 138v; cp. *supra*, p. 82.

nonconformity deserving of greater honour than the sometime 'curate' of Llannordineio. He died in 1682.[1] It is hoped for his good name as a regenerate Puritan nine years before that he, then a mere newcomer to the diocese of St. David's, was not among those who declared they would 'smoake' the bishop's chancellor for invoking the terms of the Declaration and for attempting to interrupt meetings addressed by unlicenced teachers. Happily for him the context of that letter rather points to unrepentant Quakers.[2] But one conviction must come home to every student of his career: Maurice was a wonderfully different character in 1672-1673 from the spineless conformist who wrote at the end of 1661 that the death of a Bishop of Hereford meant 'losse and Inconvenience' to him.[3]

1 In the *N.L.W. Add. MS.* 366A, f. 135, there is an elegy composed to him by a 'Rogger Wills,' with the lines—

"Heare lieth one of Abel's race
Whom Caine did hunt from place to place."

See also Sir Joseph Bradney's *Hist. Mon.*, i, Plate VI (between pp. 164-165).

2 *Tanner MS.* 146, f. 138v.

3 *N.L.W. MS.* 3071E, 149 (closing words of the letter to Maurice Gruffydd). The bishop was Nicholas Monck, brother of the General. He had died 'a senight hence.'

XIV.

ORDINARY LICENCES: NORTH WALES.

There were a great number of Dissenting preachers in the diocese of St. David's, says Bishop Lucy in 1673, who pretended to have licences, 'but having been called to shew them will shew none.' And we have heard one of his archdeacons referring to *licenced* teachers when the question of date positively proves they were nothing of the kind, and describing the neighbourhood of Brecon as full of 'conventicles'—called by him 'conventicles,' it is presumed, because they were taught by teachers who had no licences to produce. No effort to recapture the names of these bold men will be made in these chapters. But some account will be given of those who *could* produce documents duly sanctioned by the King and the Earl of Arlington. Some attempt will be made (as in the case of the Denbighshire nondescripts) to get some sense out of the nonsense of the clerks, more especially in regard to place-names. Here and there we shall call attention to veteran licencees who had been busy preaching the Word in the days of the Civil War, or to younger men who had grown to maturity under the hue and cry of persecution. All arranged according to counties.

(i) Anglesey.

"There hath not been any church in this county of the constitution aforesaid [that is, a 'gathered' or 'congregated' church, with pastors and other officers] nor any number of people professing religion in the power and strictness of it, joining with any church elsewhere, in all these late times."[1] This tremendous indictment of Anglesey Puritanism, written by Henry Maurice in 1675, finds proof and apposite illustration in the simple fact that not a single licence came to the island in 1672-1673. Nor is there the slightest evidence that any

1 *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 511.

of the islanders took the trouble of asking for one. Yet there were well over a dozen *so-called* Puritan ministers at work there on the eve of the Restoration.

(ii) Caernarvon.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Bodvel [House]	*No particulars[1] of teacher or householder*	*5 Sept. ..*	*238*	*..*	*Ind.*
Caernarvon..	*Ellis Rowlands at his own house.*	*5 Sept.*	*244*	*Ejected Clynnog, 1660.*	*Pr.*
Llangybi ..	*Ellis Williams at his own house.*	*5 Sept. ..*	*248*	*..*	*Pr.*
Pentyrch [Llangybi].	*Wm. Rowlands at his own house.*	*5 Sept. ..*	*238*	*..*	*Ind.*
Ty'nycoed ..	*John Williams at his own house.*	*5 Sept. ..*	*238*	*Ejected Llanbeblig, 1661.*	*Congr.*
Yin y Crie..	*John Rowlands at his own house.*	*5 Sept. ..*	*238*		*Ind.*

Of the adventures of Ellis Rowlands—his arrest at Clynnog in 1660 and the dragging down from the pulpit—enough has been said already. It has been casually mentioned also that two of these licencees, the two Rowlands, were present in April 1676 when the Llangybi conventicle was dramatically surprised by Sheriff Glynne of Plasnewydd. In the *Mostyn MS.* which describes that event, the two are associated with the neighbourhood of Llangybi,[2] which goes a long way to explain why Henry Maurice does not refer to either of them as living in the neighbourhood of Pwllheli in 1672. No doubt both were among his hearers in Llanarmon churchyard on the Sabbath of 15 September.

What is one to make of the clerk's frightful creation *Yin y Crie* ? Lyon Turner supplies the second element with a pretty diæresis which the original MS. does not warrant[3] ; on p. 180 of his work Dr. Thomas Rees easily arrives at Ty'nycaeau (he might as well have written Ynyscynhaiarn) ; in a very interesting note in his *Diwygwyr Cymru* Mr. Beriah Evans maintains that the strange form is no other than Ty'nycoed, the same Ty'nycoed as that of John Williams.[4] But it is impossible that the same clerk on the same p. 238 of the *Entry Book* wrote Ty'nycoed passably correct in two entries, and could not get nearer than *Yin y Crie* in two other places on the same page. Whatsoever place precisely

1 See *Note* at the end of this chapter.
2 *N. L. W. MS.* 3072, 10.
3 *O.R.*, ii, 1201.
4 p. 175, n. 2.

was the home of John Rowlands must be sought for in Eifionydd and not in Lleyn. The Mostyn document is definite on that point.[1]

The *Entry Book* describes William Rowlands as living at 'Pentirik Pwllheley.' Since the Sheriff's report describes him as 'of Llangybi,' Pwllheli must be looked upon as a mere geographical convenience, and a tribute to its importance as a marketing centre. The name of William Rowlands had come down to Robert Jones Rhoslan as living at Maenllwyd by Llangybi[2]; 'Pentirik' corresponds to Pentyrch Isaf or Uchaf in Llangybi or more likely to the township of that name in which Maenllwyd was situated, which would bring the tradition of Robert Jones into harmony with the entry on the Indulgence document. Maenllwyd is situated about one mile N.W. of Llangybi.[3] This fact and the Mostyn reference make it unnecessary to weave fantastic theories about a substantial farmer named William Rowlands who lived at Treflan in the commote of Is-Gwyrfai,[4] or about the three men of that name who lived about 1671 within the town and liberties of Caernarvon.[5]

Probably the most absurd entry in the whole range of the *Entry Book* is that on p. 238—*Bodwell House at Tuynycoied*, Bodvel being in the parish of Llannor and Ty'nycoed—the home of John Williams—in the parish of Llangian, places kept separate by the flat marshes of Rhydyclafdy and the high ridges of Mynydd Mynytho. Lyon Turner is of opinion that the Whitehall clerks ran into one ridiculous formula what the original application of John Williams kept carefully apart,[6] which was—a desire that he be allowed to preach at his own house in Llangian and also at the historic house of Bodvel, now strangely hospitable to nonconformist preachers. There is much sound sense behind this opinion. Without, however, a view of that original application and of the actual licence (or licences) issued to

1 What of *Ynys Creua* or *Ynys y Creua* in the parish of Llangybi? I owe this suggestion to "Mynyddwr," one of Carneddog's knowing correspondents (*Yr Herald Cymraeg*, Apr. 13, 1926).
2 *Drych yr Amseroedd* (1898 edn.), p. 24.
3 Tithe Schedule, No. 823. The writer owes the Maenllwyd-Pentyrch solution to information supplied by the local antiquary *Cybi*.
4 *Lay Subsidy Roll* 220/161 (about 1665).
5 *Exch. Lay Subsidy* 220/165 (10 January, 22 Chas. II).
6 *Trans. Cong. Hist. Soc.*, ii, 263.

John Williams—all of them wanting—that opinion cannot pass into fact.

(iii) Denbigh.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Cristionydd ..	*Wm. Wynn at his own house.*	*28 Oct.* ..	201 261	..	*Congr.*
Glimmin ..	*The house of John Hughes.*	*5 July*..	*217*	..	*Congr.*
Kensfroid ..	*The house of Elizabeth Elston.*	*18 Nov*...	*269*	..	*Congr.*
Llanfair D.C.	*Jonathan Roberts at his own house.*	*22 May*..	*135*	*Ejected Llanfair, 1660.*	*Congr.*
Penyrallt ..	*The house of John Pritchard.*	*18 Nov*...	*270*	..	*Congr.*
Ruabon ..	*Philip Rogers at house of Roger Kynaston.*	*22 May*..	*135*	..	*Congr.*
Ruthin ..	*The house of John Roberts.*	*18 Nov.*	*269*	..	*Congr.*
Wimblimglym	*The house of David Thomas.*	*18 Nov.*	*270*	..	*Congr.*
Wrexham ..	*John Evans at the house of Ed. Kenrick.*	*22 May*	*129*	*Ejected Oswestry, 1660 (Schoolmaster).*	*Congr.*
,, ..	*The house of John Hughes.*	*13 May*..	*106*	..	*Pr.*

The most arresting personalities in this list are Jonathan Roberts and John Evans, two old Oxford men. Although one instinctively associates a sometime Fellow of Jesus, if a Puritan at all, with the cautious and conservative school, it is a curious fact that Roberts at both ends of his career appears in an environment of stirring events: in 1649, and he a junior Fellow, he assisted in presenting articles of charge against the newly appointed Principal Dr. Michael Roberts, and was alleged by that Principal of having so upturned the affairs of the society as to bring about a temporary 'break in housekeeping'[1]; in 1682, just a year before his death, he was (in company with James Owen) holding up the hands of Philip Henry in that memorable eight hours' debate with Bishop William Lloyd at Oswestry.[2]

John Evans started life as a Puritan inauspiciously. Son of an Anglican rector of Penegoes, a Balliol non-submitter to the Puritan Visitors, secretly given holy orders by a deposed Bishop of St. David's, he is suddenly found Puritan schoolmaster first at Bala and then at Oswestry.[3] He refused to conform at the Restoration, and in the conventicle

1 *St. Papers Dom., Interregnum*, A. 21, p. 202; also A. 130, No. 25.

2 *Diaries*, p. 309. The Bishop about 1705 (by then promoted to Worcester) supplied some very vivid recollections of the debate to Dr. John Walker, taking care to describe Jonathan Roberts as 'an Indipendant' (*MS. J. Walker* c. 2, f. 468v).

3 Montagu Burrows: *Register of Parly. Visitors*, p. 101; Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 842.

returns of 1669 is reported as preaching illegally at Oswestry, Llanfyllin and Llanfechain.[1] By 1672 he is at Wrexham, and in later years was to give anxious hours to Bishop William Lloyd in the latter's endeavours to win him back from the ways of separation. The conventiclers of Wrexham in that Bishop's time foregathered at Bryn-y-ffynnon[2]; we have A. N. Palmer's high authority that John Evans occupied part of a house of that name during the latter period of his life—a house rented (to the evident disgust of the Bishop) from Sir William Williams, Speaker of the House of Commons from 1679 to 1681. It was not at Bryn-y-ffynnon that the Congregational Dissenters were to meet in 1672: it was for the house of Edward Kenrick that the licence agent made application; the record of receipt suggests that John Evans was to teach 'in his [own] house'; but the *E. B.* is definite that the licence as actually drafted adhered strictly to the terms of application.[3]

The house of John Hughes at Wrexham, though geographically in Denbighshire, depended upon English Flint for its religious supplies. It was licenced for Presbyterians only, and was within the orbit of Philip Henry's influence. He called to preach there at least twice in the month of July. Three men of this name were paying hearth tax in the neighbourhood in 1672-1673, one for four hearths in Wrexham Regis, another for three in the High Street, another for one in Wrexham Fechan.[4] If the High Street Hughes be the bookseller suggested by A. N. Palmer, that would not comport very well with the barn in which, according to Henry, the Presbyterians of Wrexham congregated at this time.[5] Booksellers do not usually keep barns. Not far away was Cristionydd near Ruabon, where lived William Wynn, a former Commissioner for the Propagation. As a licence for the house was issued on 22 July and for himself as teacher there as late as 28 October, it seems that the transformation

1 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 139b.
2 *Tanner MS.* 146, f. 33v (letter to Sancroft, dated 24 Nov., 1682).
3 Cp. *S.P.* 321, 237, 277, with *E.B.*, 129, and the Index in *E.B.* 38B.
4 *Lay Subsidy Roll* 221/299a.
5 Cp. *Hist. Older Noncon. of Wrexham*, p. 48, with *Diaries*, p. 255. Notwithstanding the barn difficulty, it is a great temptation to believe that this Presbyterian licence-holder was the "John Hughes o Wrecsam" at whose place the new Welsh edition of the New Testament, brought out by Stephen Hughes in this same year 1672, could be procured [G. J. Williams: *Stephen Hughes a'i Gyfnod*, in *Y Cofiadur* (1926), p. 20]. And may he not be the same John Hughes who in 1666 used a pair of spectacles as a tradesman's token? (W. Boyne: *Traders' Tokens*, sec. edn., subed. Lloyd, p. 1197).

from layman to preacher occurred within these three months.

It is tolerably easy to see Cristionydd in the ' Christionate ' of the clerk, but what of the wonderful places *Glimmin*, *Kensfroid*, and the unearthly conglomerate *Wimblimglym* ? Frank Bate suggests ' Glyn ' for the first, ' Tynford ' or ' Henffordd ' for the second,[1] while Lyon Turner makes a valiant effort to equate the third with Nantglyn.[2] As to Kensfroid, the similarity of K and Ll in seventeenth century script makes it almost certain that the word stands for Llansantffraid, a district situate in the valley of the Ceiriog ; perhaps Bate builded better than he knew in suggesting ' Glyn[ceiriog] ' for Glimmin ; the next link in this chain of surmise is to choose out of the round score of David Thomases who were paying hearth tax in Denbighshire in 1673 either the person of that name who lived in the township of Brynkinallt in the Chirkland hundred or the David Thomas who lived in the parish of Llansantffraid itself (each was rated on one hearth)[3]—thus the random guess of Mr. Beriah Evans for ' Wimblimglym ' (– Melin [y] Glyn)[4] fits more easily into this argument than the elaborate analysis by which Lyon Turner arrived at Nantglyn. The weird names now read as Glynceiriog, Llansantffraid, Melin y Glyn, all in the same district.

In defence of the Ceiriog theory the words of Henry Maurice in 1675 may be cited how some members of the Wrexham gathered church ' did meet near Chirk Castle '[5] : if Morgan Llwyd named John Pugh of Glynceiriog as one of the executors of his will,[6] what was to prevent one of Llwyd's successors in the person of John Evans from crossing the Berwyn to preach at the houses of John Hughes, Elizabeth Elston and David Thomas ? It is true the compilers of the religious census of 1676 could not find a single nonconformist in the whole Ceiriog Valley.[7] But no one at this time of day

1 App. vii, p. lxxxiv.
2 *O.R.*, ii, 1199.
3 *Lay Subsidy Rolls* 221/299 *b* and *c*. These happen to be undated, but it is known that Roll *a* in this group records the ratings of February, 1672-1673.
4 *Diwygwyr Cymru*, p. 172
5 *Broadmead Recs.*, pp. 513-514.
6 *Gweithiau*, ii, 280. In the *Word for God* of 1655 (the passionate protest against the Protestants organised by Vavasor Powell) the name of this John Pugh is immediately preceded by a *David Thomas* (p. 11). Was he our David Thomas of Wimblimglym ?
7 *Salt MS.*, f. 414.

ought to accept unchallenged the figures of the census until the bona fides of the vicars and churchwardens of each parish have been closely inquired into, more especially how far they had observed the Archbishop's unconcealed desire that the numbers of sectaries should be put as low as possible.

(iv) Flint.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Broad Oak ..	*Philip Henry at his own house.*	*30 April*	*49*	*Ejected Worthenbury, 1661.*	*Pr.*
Bryn ..	*The house of Luke Lloyd.*	*5 Sept.*	*244*	..	*Pr.*
Hanmer ..	*The house of Wm. Bennett.*	*5 Sept.*	*237*	..	*Pr.*
„ ..	*The house of James Jackson.*	*5 Sept.*	*237*	..	*Pr.*
„ ..	*The house of Catherine Keys.*	*5 Sept.*	*237*	..	*Pr.*
Plas Teg ..	*William Jones at his own house.*	*28 Oct.*	*261*	*Ejected Denbigh, 1660.*	*Congr.*

William Jones stands alone in Welsh Flint. All the others figure in Henry's diaries. Luke Lloyd of Bryn, another sometime Propagation Commissioner, was one of his oldest friends, at whose house he often preached in face of the Conventicle Acts. Once he was charged by Sir John Hanmer with going there by 'a back way.'[1] James Jackson seems to have acted as treasurer for the money collected in 1671 for the children of Richard Steele his old Minister.[2] As for William Bennett, amongst many other entries by Henry concerning him, surely this is the most obscure—'rec^{d} of Wm. Benet for a musket w^{ch} Mr. Steel gave mee, 8^{s}.'[3]

(v) Merioneth.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Bodwenni ..	*The house of Ellis Davies.*	*25 July*	*215*	..	*Congr.*
Cynfal ..	*The house of Mary Lloyd.*	*22 July*	*201*	..	*Congr.*
Erwgoyel ..	*The house of John Owen.*	*25 July*	*210*	..	*Congr.*
Llanegryn ..	*Hugh Owen at his own house.*	*22 May*	*135*	*Silenced, 1660* ..	*Congr.*
Peniarth ..	*The house of David Williams.*	*25 July*	*210*	..	*Congr.*

Other counties can boast of more licences, but none more replete with interest than these. Samuel Palmer of the

1 *Diaries*, p. 176 (under 30 Sept , 1665)
2 *ib.*, p. 236.
3 *ib.*, p. 152 (12 Nov., 1663).

Nonconformist Memorial did yeoman service in amplifying into four pages the scant reference of Calamy's *Account* to Hugh Owen of Bronyclydwr.[1] It is still a matter of mystery how Calamy's informant about Welsh ministers, James Owen of Oswestry—who not only had been assistant-minister to Hugh Owen in his later years, but had also preached his funeral sermon in 1699—could only supply his bare name for Calamy's second edition of 1713. Let it be admitted that James Owen had been expressly forbidden by the dying man to mention his name in the aforementioned sermon[2]; but assuredly that injunction was not meant to freeze up a sympathetic pen for evermore. For charity under trials, for Christian fervour in the midst of deadening materialism, for the most fruitful forms of self-sacrifice, Hugh Owen had no superior in that century. His virtues were admitted by Anglican and Puritan alike. Compared with these, the facts so assiduously adduced by modern biographers about his descent from a Chamberlain of North Wales,[3] and even concerning his very close relationship to the great Dissenting theologian Dr. John Owen, are subjects of very subsidiary interest. It is well to know that he outlived the persecutions that set in after the Indulgence to be recognised by the organisers of the 'Happy Union' of 1690-1691 as the pastor of the large Bapto-Independent congregation of Merioneth and Montgomery.[4]

Coming to the householders, Ellis Davies of Bodwenni near Bala was a very obscure person until his name was discovered in a *Rawlinson MS.* of 1687 as a person fully qualified to be a J.P., but kept from the commission because of his Dissent.[5] Bodwenni became a favourite resort of Independent preachers in the first years after the Toleration Act[6] till '*Elis Davydh, y perchennawr dywaetha*,' passed away just before the close of the century.[7] The foreign form 'Erwgoyel,' where John Owen lived, must be the same as Erwgoed by Dolgelley, a point indirectly proved by a note

1 Cp. *Memorial*, iii, 490-494, with Calamy, ii, 710.
2 *ib.*, 492.
3 For example, *Enwogion y Ffydd*, pt. ii, 480.
4 *Gordon MS.*, ff. 92, 98.
5 A. 139[illegible], f. 168. Bate (App. vii, lxxxiv) has *Bodgadvan*, an incorrect and unnecessary effort.
6 *Hanes Egl. Ann.*, i, 401.
7 Edward Lhwyd: *Parochialia*, p. 60 (Suppt. Arch. Camb., Apr. 1910). He places Bodwenni definitely under Llandderfel.

at the foot of p. 594 in the Welsh edition of Pennant's *Tours in Wales*.[1] Mary Lloyd of Cynfal was not improbably a sister of Morgan Lloyd.[2] The Peniarth licence shows that Puritanism had pushed its way past the Bird Rock to the glens of Llanfihangel y Pennant.

It is an especial pleasure to note that the county which had produced both the great Welsh mystic and the most conscientious of the regicides was not unrepresented in the activities of the Indulgence.

(vi) Montgomery.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Bryngwyn ..	*The house of John Kynaston.*	*25 July*	*210*	..	*Congr.*
Gunley ..	*Richard Price at his own house.*	*18 Oct.* / *23 Oct.*	*262* / *269*	..	*Congr.*
Newtown ..	*The house of Widow Morris.*	*30 Sept.*	*260*	..	*Pr.*
Welshpool	*Hugh Rogers at his own house.*	*5 Sept.*	*246*	*Ejected Newtown, 1660.*	*Pr.* / *Congr.*
,, ..	*The house of David Rogers.*	*5 Sept.*	*246*	..	*Pr.*

The outstanding character in this list is Richard Price of Gunley. He had displayed his allegiance to the Puritan faith in diverse ways: he had been one of the ablest Welsh captains in the army of the Parliament; it was he who had the unpleasant duty of stating charges of delinquency against a Puritan Principal of Jesus in 1649[3]; he became 'the elder and pillar' of the Vavasorian church in Montgomeryshire and remained so throughout the troublous days of the Restoration up to his death in 1674.[4] A peculiarity about his licences in 1672 was that after securing that of 'teacher' on 18 October he had to wait for ten days before its complement was granted.

After collating the licences granted to Hugh Rogers at Welshpool, it is open to doubt whether the one granted to him for his own house or that for the house of David Rogers was the licence interpreted as final by the authorities (as far as the *Entry Book* goes, there is no separate and specific

1 Caernarvon reprint, ed. Principal Rhys, App. xxviii.
2 Might she not be the sister referred to in the *Thurloe St. Papers*, ii, 226? A. N. Palmer is of opinion that the licencee was his *mother* (*H.O.N.W.*, p. 35). Mary was certainly *her* name.
3 *St. Pap. Dom., Interregnum*, A. 21, p. 202.
4 *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 517.

record that his own house was licenced at all, it is merely 'implied').[1] Common practice and common sense agree in saying that he would preach in both.

NOTE: THE MYSTERY OF BODVEL HOUSE (p. *144*).

From a Whitehall clerk's careless moment in leaving out the name of the householder on the Bodvel House licence entry (*E.B.*, p. 238) have come many days of perplexing research, not at all devoid of interest, but hitherto failing to strike the final note of completeness. As a story of delayed solution this problem is somewhat unique. At one time the present writer fell into the fallacy that the old Bodvel family still lived there in 1672, and was disposed to think that some of them (unnatural though it seemed from the traditions of the house) had lapsed into nonconformity (*Religious Developments in Wales*, 1923, p. 66). Later he came across Mr. Gilbert Williams' excellent little monograph on the Colonel John Bodvel who died in 1663, which therefore could not be expected to treat of Bodvel House in Indulgence days. Later still, Mr. Williams very kindly called my attention to p. 69 of *Hanes Annibyniaeth Sir Gaernarfon* by the Rev. H. Ifor Jones (a work published in 1897), where it is very dogmatically stated that a *Robert Roberts* lived there in 1672, and that it was to him as householder the licence was issued. But a pretty careful examination of the *Lay Subsidy Rolls* from 1660 to 1674 at the Public Record Office, and of some *Chancery Dispensation Rolls* and land surveys in addition, refused to disclose the name of any Robert Roberts paying hearth tax for the commote of Gaflogion, in which Bodvel House was situated. A result which proved, to say the least, disappointing. Some time afterwards, in inspecting *Add. MS.* 1511 E at the National Library (a document once forming part of the Kinmel Collection) it was found on ff. 105, 171, that the Colonel's daughter, Sarah, had married a Robert Roberts (or Robartes), son of John, second baron Robartes[2] (of whose part as Lord Privy Seal in helping to shape Indulgence policy something has already been said, *supra*, p. 54). During further research to verify this entry on the Bodvel family table, one came across all manner of inaccuracies: the *Kinmel MS.* itself has a pencilled correction of 'Roberts' into 'Robarts,' a spelling with no authority whatsoever; it calls the son Earl of Radnor, when in fact he died three years before his father (Robartes was made Earl of Radnor in 1679); in the *D.N.B.*, and that by Sir Charles Firth, Bodvel is a *castle* in *Cornwall* (xlviii, 340-341); even in Mr. Gilbert Williams' account, we are told that Sarah's husband was John the father and not Robert the son. *Robert* Roberts he was: the military authorities of Carnarvon after the Restoration assessed the Bodvel estate at £1,000, making 'Robt Robts, esqr' responsible for two horses and their appropriate arms under the Militia Acts (*N.L.W. MS.* 3071, 101). It is true that in other lists of chargeable gentlemen compiled in 1661 Colonel John Bodvel is himself down for two horses, in one instance for three (*ibid.*, ff. 76, 78); but what horses of any use to the State could a man supply who lived impecuniously in London, sometimes under a feigned name, sometimes in prison for debt? It is, indeed, fortunate that the domestic infelicities of the Colonel and his wife, the triangular litigation

1 These points seem to have been overlooked by Lyon Turner in his summaries (*O.R.*, ii, 1203).

2 For the sake of convenience, the son will be called *Roberts*, the father *Robartes*. Somehow this latter spelling became the fashionable one: but it is worth noting that copies (in the *Mostyn MSS.*) of proclamations sent from the King's Council to the Earl of Carbery in Wales after 1660 invariably have *Roberts* for the father.

in which the old and young people joined (with Thomas Wynn of Boduan as an interested spectator), have nothing to do with the problem of 1672 (*Arch. Camb.*, 1883, pp. 81-83)[1]. The Robert Roberts of the Rev. Ifor Jones has thus been discovered, with the important reservation that his account leaves the impress that the esquire was an obscure farmer of Lleyn and not son to a Baron, and to be himself Viscount one day. What gives added interest to the tale is that not only was the elder Robartes once an active Parliament man, but that at the second installation of Cromwell the train of the Protector's purple robe was borne by his son, this very son Robert who married Sarah Bodvel in 1657 (*D.N.B.*, xlviii, 340-341). But the lacuna of the clerk is not yet made up. For it is in the highest degree improbable that the son of Robartes and the high-spirited daughter[2] of John Bodvel would drone away their young days in Lleyn ; it would be a foolhardy thought to imagine him in person harbouring the Welsh preachers of Gaflogion instead of enjoying life either at his father's house in London or on the paternal estate at Lanhydrock in Cornwall. Surely the house of Bodvel would be in the hands of a farming tenant or a deputed bailiff. *He* would be the householder of 1672 ; *he* was the nonconformist ; but his name is still to seek. From what obscure source did the Rev. Ifor Jones derive the name of a Hugh Glynn on p. 65 ? Ordinarily the parish registers of Llannor could be expected to give some likely clue—but they only begin in 1754 (A. M. Burke : *Ancient Parish Registers*, p. 106), or in 1700, according to information kindly supplied by the present rector. And the transcripts in the Diocesan Registry of Bangor simply cover the years 1678, 1680, 1682, 1683, 1685. In them also there is no reference to anybody connected with Bodvel House (attested by Mr. Ivor Pryce, M.A.). Allusions to this ancient seat of the Bodvels, but not relevant to the problem here in hand, may be found in the collections of Myrddin Fardd (*Gleanings from God's Acre*, pp. 143-144), and in an article lately contributed to the *Cyfarwyddwr* by Mr. Bob Owen (Oct. 1923, ' Siencyn Morgan,' p. 300).

1 There is a moderately loud echo of this unsettled case in the words of the Mostyn assessment—' Robt Robts esqr *and* all the estate of Bodvell. £1,000, 2 horses,' and much louder ones in the *Calendar of Wynn Papers* (1927), esp. entries 2371-2372, 2478, 2496.

2 Incidentally, she was considered one of the great ' beauties ' of the time (Pepys : *Diary*, ed. Gregory Smith, pp. 311, 643).

XV.

ORDINARY LICENCES: SOUTH WALES.

(i) Brecknock.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Llanafanfawr	*Thomas Evans as teacher (house implied).*	*3 Feb., 1672-3.*	*286*	*Ejected Maesmynus, 1660.*	*Bapt.*
Llanfeugian	*Lewis Prytherch at the house of David Williams.*	*3 Feb., 1672-3.*	*286 287*	..	*Ind.*
Llanigon ..	*The house of William Watkins.*	*30 Sept.*	*254*	..	*Congr.*
Talgarth ..	*David Williams as teacher.*	*30 Sept.*	*254*	..	*Ind.*
„ ..	*The house of William Watkins.*[1]	*30 Sept.*	*254*	..	*Ind.*

A tantalising list. So far no evidence is forthcoming to prove whether the Watkinses of Talgarth and Llanigon were one or two men, or whether David Williams, teacher in Talgarth, was the same person as the David Williams who was householder at Llanfeugian. The fact that the *Lay Subsidy Rolls* of Charles II name no less than three William Watkinses in Talgarth,[2] and that practically every parish in the county had a David Williams among the payers of hearth tax, seem to say there is no necessity to work out equations unnatural in themselves and unjustified by geography. It will be assumed that the teacher of Talgarth and the householder of Llanfeugian are two distinct persons.[3]

There are at least three names in Brecknock Puritan history that suggest themselves in connection with the Talgarth teacher: David Williams the Propagation schoolmaster at Tretower (but a person of that name paid hearth tax at Tretower after the Restoration)[4]; David William

1 The entry runs—'The W^m^ Watkins . . .,' and immediately follows the record of the teacher's licence granted to David Williams. The lacuna, according to Principal J. H. Davies (*Traethodydd*, lvi, 329), ought to read 'same to'; that is, a *teacher's* licence was given to Watkins as well. The Puritan story of the shire favours 'house of.' That is also the reading in *C.S.P.*, 1672, p. 678.

2 *Subsidy Roll* 263/29.

3 See also *supra*, pp. 122-123, for a discussion of this case from another point of view.

4 *H.P.M.*, p. 228; *Subsidy Roll* 219/63.

[Probert], Puritan minister once settled at Llandefaelog, who might have migrated to the district of Talgarth after the passing of the Five Mile Act[1]; and the David Williams of Cefn-y-gwaelod by Troedrhiwdalar, whom tradition represented to Joshua Thomas as a busy preacher in the days of Charles II, and whose sphere of activity might have included Talgarth in 1672.[2] Maurice's letter of 1675 mentions a David Williams as ordained elder in the gathered church of Brecknock: he could not very well be other than the licenced teacher of 1672. Nor is there much doubt that the Lewis Prytherch of Llanfeugian who figures on p. 287 of the *Entry Book* was the elder-elect of 1675.[3]

As to Thomas Evans, the Baptist of Llanafan, it just happens that his certificate to preach under the Propagators, subscribed officially by five Commissioners, is the only one the present writer has come across[4] (apart, that is, from the bare records of such appointments in the *Lambeth Books* and from the sums of salaries paid them as preserved in the *Baron Price MS.* in the Bodleian). The barbaric exhumation and re-burial of one of his followers have already been referred to. Frank Bate states he is the same Thomas Evans who had a licence to teach at Nympsfield in Gloucestershire at the house of the widow Pegler.[5] Though they were both entered as Baptists, this is a most unwarrantable assumption. The Nympsfield licence was issued on 28 October[6]: if the two Thomas Evanses were indeed the same, why should he have a licence for an obscure hamlet in the Cotswold Hills more than three months before that for Llanafan, in the county with which he had always been associated?

(ii) Cardigan.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Cardigan ..	*James Davies at his own house.*	*8 May*	*85*	*Ejected Merthyr, (Carm.), 1662.*	*Congr.*
,, ..	*The house of Widow Gwyn.*	*28 Oct.*	*266*	..	*Congr.*
Cellan ..	*Evan Hughes at the house of Dd. Hughes.*	*28 Oct.*	*266*	*Ejected Llandyfriog, 1662.*	*Congr.*

1 Dr. John Walker: *Sufferings*, i, 160.
2 *Hanes y Bedyddwyr*, p. 262. He heard this about 1780 from the mouth of a grandson of the preacher, himself 88 years old.
3 For both, see *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 512.
4 Full copy in Joshua Thomas: *Hanes*, p. 261.
5 App. vii, p. xxviii. Blackburne Daniell falls into the same mistake (*C.S.P.*, 1672-1673, Preface, xli).
6 *E.B.*, p. 268.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Dihewid ..	*The house of Philip David.*	*28 Oct.*	*266*	..	*Congr.*
Lampeter ..	*The house of Evan David.*	*28 Oct.*	*266*	..	*Congr.*
Llanbadarn Odwyn.	*Morgan Howell at the house of John Jones.*	*28 Oct.*	*266*	*Silenced, 1662.*	*Congr.*
Llanddewi-brefi.	*David Jones at his own house.*	*28 Oct.*	*266*	..	*Congr.*
Llandisilio-gogo.	*The house of David Thomas.*	*28 Oct.*	*266*	..	*Congr.*
Llanfair Trelygen.	*The house of David Rees.*	*28 Oct.*	*266*	..	*Congr.*

In this list Morgan Howell, born at Bettws Bledrws, is the most picturesque personality. In his unregenerate days he attempted to prevent the field-preaching of Walter Cradock, started a game of football, and sprained his ankle; thus compelled to listen to the wise words of the greatest Welsh Independent, Howell was converted to be one of his disciples.[1] In February, 1654-1655, he joined the Congregational church of Lampeter ministered to by Rees (or Rice) Powell,[2] soon began to preach, and was among those unordained candidates for the ministry who were 'silenced' by the Act of Uniformity.[3] Whatever grounds there are for thinking he was originally a rich man, by 1691 he is described as 'an ancient usefull man,' but 'very poore.'[4]

The householder John Jones, at whose house at Llwynrhys Howell was permitted to preach in 1672, was very closely associated by marriage with nonconformist families, and became the ancestor of distinguished preachers (some of whom are now alive).[5] He also is described in the *Gordon MS.* as 'an ancient usefull man.'

(iii) Carmarthen.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Cenarth ..	*James Davies at the house of John James.*	*8 May*	*85*	..	*Congr.*
Llangennech	*Robert Morgan at the house of Joshua Franklin.*	*30 Sept.*	*251* *260*	..	*Bapt.*
,, ..	*The house of Edward Williams.*	*30 Sept.*	*260*	..	*Bapt.*
Llannon ..	*The house of John Morgan*	*30 Sept.*	*260*	..	*Bapt.*

1 For this circumstantial account, see *N.L.W. Add. MS.* 128C, ff. 66b, 67 (among the *Thomas Charles' MSS.* dealing with Puritan preachers).

2 There is a reference to him in *Y Cofiadur* (1923), p. 24. He ended his days as an Anglican conformist (*Religious Developments in Wales*, pp. 495, 496).

3 Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 716.

4 *Gordon MS.*, f. 95.

5 Alx. Gordon: *Freedom after Ejection*, p. 294.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Llanstephan	*Stephen Hughes at the house of Evan Morris.*	*17 April*	*26*	*Ejected Mydrim, 1661.*	*Congr.*
Pencader ..	*Stephen Hughes at the house of Widow Jenkins.*	*17 April*	*26*	..	*Congr.*

Attention will be concentrated here on the Llangennech group of Baptists, and on the carelessness of historians in deciphering correctly the entries on pp. 251, 260, of the *Entry Book*. Those documents are all clear that the place was in Carmarthenshire but spell it Llangenyth (and once Llangennyth). After discovering a village-name in Gower actually spelt Llangenith, Prof. Lyon Turner decided to transfer the whole group to his Glamorgan summaries.[1] Before the publication of his third volume the mistake was put right, and Robert Morgan, Joshua Franklin and Edward Williams were restored to the companionship of their old friend John Morgan of Llannon.[2]

Even the Baptist historian Spinther James did not see that the *ffranch* of p. 251 was a contracted corruption of the *ffranklin* of p. 260; indeed, he made them into two men, spelt one *French*, and placed him with Robert Morgan at Llangenith in Gower.[3] *There were* Franklins in the neighbourhood of Llangennech, and Baptists to boot; for did not the new arrangements made by John Miles at Ilston in 1657, arrangements described in his *Hanes* by Spinther himself, provide that meetings belonging to that widely-ramified church were to be held at the house of brother Franklin every Sunday and every Friday ?[4] *That* Franklin's name was Jenkin, and he lived at Llangennech. And does not Henry Maurice in his report of 1675 refer to Baptists at Llangennech who join with other Baptists in Glamorgan ?[5] Frank Bate added his own error to the Llangennech interpretation by calling Franklin *Joseph* instead of *Joshua*.[6]

1 *O.R.*, ii, 1218.
2 App. iv, p. 857
3 *Hanes y Bedyddwyr*, ii, 457.
4 *ib.*, ii, 329; cp. Joshua Thomas: *Hanes*, p. 92.
5 *Broadmead Records*, p. 512.
6 App. vii, p. lviii.

(iv) Glamorgan.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Baglan ..	*Robert Thomas at his own house.*	*16 July*	*197*	*Silenced, 1662* ..	*Congr.*
Bishopston	*The house of Henry Griffith.*	*20 April*	*39*	..	*Congr.*
Bride's, St...	*The house of Widow Williams.*	*15 June*	*188*	..	*Bapt.*
Bridgend ..	*Thomas Joseph at his own house.*	*15 June*	*188*	*Ejected Llangeinor, 1660.*	*Bapt.*
Cardiff ..	*John French at his own house.*	*15 June*	*187*	*Ejected Wenvoe, 1662*	*Pr.*
Cildeudy ..	*The house of Rees Powell.*	*18 Nov.*	*273*	..	*Pr.*
Cowbridge	*Saml. Jones at the house of Eve Christopher.*	*30 Sept.*	*254*	..	*Pr.*
Eglwysilan ..	*Thos. John at the house of Wm. John.*	*10 Aug.*	*234*	..	*Ind.*
Gelligaer ..	*The house of Lewis Rees.*	*10 Aug.*	*234*	..	*Congr.*
Goitrehen ..	*Saml. Jones at the house of Rees Powell.*	*30 April*	*50*	..	*Pr.*
Kenfig ..	*Jacob Christopher at the house of Lewis Alward.*	*16 July*	*197*	*Silenced, 1662*	*Ind.*
Llanfabon	*The house of William Rowlands.*	*10 Aug.*	*234*	..	*Congr.*
Llangewydd..	*The house of Llewellyn Morgan.*	*15 June*	*188*	..	*Bapt.*
Llangynwyd	*Saml. Jones at his own house.*	*30 April*	*50*	*Ejected Llangynwyd, 1662.*	*Pr.*
Margam ..	*Saml. Jones at his own house.*	*15 June*	*181, 196*	..	*Ind.*
Merthyr Tydfil.	*Henry Williams at the house of Howell Rees.*	*3 Feb., 1673.*	*287*	..	*Ind.*
Neath ..	*The house of Elizabeth Morgan.*	*18 Nov.*	*273*	..	*Pr.*
Newton Nottage.	*Watkin Cradock at his own house.*	*16 July*	*197*	..	*Ind.*
,, ..	*Howell Thomas at the house of Wm. Andrews.*	*15 June*	*188*	*Ejected Glyncorrwg, 1660.*	*Bapt.*
Nicholaston	*The house of Robert Gethin.*	*20 April*	*39*	..	*Congr.*
Rhossilly ..	*The house of Richard Bevan.*	*20 April*	*39*	..	*Congr.*
Swansea ..	*Daniel Higgs at his own house.*	*17 April*	*26*	*Ejected Porteynon, 1662.*	*Congr.*
,, ..	*The house of Stephen Hughes.*	*20 April*	*39*	..	*Congr.*
,, ..	*Marmaduke Matthews at his own house.*	*12 April*	*17*	*Ejected Swansea, 1662.*	*Ind.*
,, ..	*Lewis Thomas at the house of Wm. Dykes.*	*30 Sept.*	*251, 260*	..	*Bapt.*
Wenvoe ..	*Joshua Miller at the house of Morgan Thomas.*	*15 June*	*187*	*Ejected St. Andrew's, 1660.*	*Pr.*

The 'Llangewyth' problem in Glamorgan is no problem at all compared with that of Llangenith-Llangennech under Carmarthen, although the present writer has to admit that in another work he thought it was Llangenith in Gower.[1] The Bodleian transcriber has 'Llangewish.'[2] No doubt the

1 *Trans. Welsh Bapt. Hist. Soc.* (1916-1919), p. 29.
2 *Jones MS.*, f. 34.

home of Llewellyn Morgan was at Llangewydd between Aberavon and Bridgend, he being an easterly disciple of the Baptists of Ilston.

There are strong grounds for believing that the 'own house' of the Independent Robert Thomas was 'y^e^ hall in Bagland' in which he lived in 1666[1]; in this connection it is somewhat curious that he matriculated at Jesus College, Oxford, in 1658 as son of a 'pleb.'[2]; however, the *Gordon MS.* describes him about 1690 not only as 'a godly old man,' but also as one who 'hath an Estate.'[3]

A glance at the above table of Glamorgan licences and a collation of pp. 50, 181 and 196 of the *Entry Book* seem to suggest that Samuel Jones was the occupier of two houses in his own name, one in Llangynwyd and one in Margam. We might conclude also that he was a religious trimmer who could change colour from Presbyterian to Independent as he wended his way past the Bodvoc Stone on Margam mountain. But that 'Ind.' was one of the little mistakes of Arlington's clerk.

(v) Monmouth.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Abergavenny	*John Edwards at his own house.*	*10 Aug.*	*232*	*Ejected Llangorse, 1660.*	*Bapt.*
„ ..	*Christopher Price at his own house.*	*10 Aug.*	*232*	..	*Bapt.*
Aberystruth	*John Jones at his own house.*	*10 Aug.*	*232*	..	*Ind.*
„ ..	*The house of Llewellyn Rosser.*	*10 Aug.*	*231*	..	*Ind.*
Bedwellty ..	*Thomas Jones at his own house.*	*10 Aug.*	*232*	..	*Bapt.*
Bettws ..	*Reginald Morgan at his own house.*	*5 Sept.*	*231, 245*	*Ejected Vaynor, 1660.*	*Pr., Ind.*
Caerleon ..	*Henry Walter at his own house.*	*10 June*	*166, 169*	*Ejected Newport, 1662.*	*Ind.*
Caerwent ..	*The house of John Morris.*	*10 June*	*166*	..	*Ind.*
Caldicot ..	*The house of James Lewis.*	*10 Aug.*	*187, 234*	..	*Cong., Pr.*
Christchurch	*The house of Joan Jones.*	*10 June*	*156*	..	*Ind.*
Henllys ..	*The house of Margaret Jones.*	*10 Aug.*	*231*	..	*Ind.*
Llangibby ..	*Walter Williams at the house of Ed. Waters.*	*22 July*	*204*	..	*Congr.*
Llangwm ..	*Wm. Milman at the house of Wm. Richards.*	*25 July*	*204, 220*	..	*(No defn. of sect).*

1 *Trans. Welsh Bapt. Hist. Soc.* (1916-1919), p. 55.
2 Alx. Gordon: *Freedom after Ejection*, p. 367.
3 f. 94. He died on 2 April, 1692 (*Trans. Carm. Antiq. Soc.*, xl, 50). For some further information about Robert Thomas, see D. Rhys Phillips: *Hist. Vale of Neath* (1925), pp. 146-148.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Llantilio Pertholy.	*Wm. Prichard at his own house.*	*10 Aug.*	*232*	..	*Bapt.*
Llantrisant ..	*Geo. Robinson at the house of Geo. Morgan.*	*22 July*	*203, 204*	*Ejected Llangattock, 1662.*	*Congr.*
Llanwenarth	*The house of John Watkins.*	*10 Aug.*	*231*	..	*Ind.*
Magor ..	*Thos. Barnes at the house of Walter Jones.*	*10 Aug.*	*234, 237, 239*	*Ejected Magor, 1662.*	*Ind.*
Marshfield ..	*The house of Jane Reynolds.*	*10 Aug.*	*231*	..	*Ind.*
Mynyddislwyn.	*Watkin Jones at his own house.*	*10 Aug.*	*187, 232*	..	*Ind.*
,, ..	*The house of Thomas James.*	*10 Aug.*	*231*	..	*Ind.*
,, ..	*The house of Evan Williams.*	*10 Aug.*	*231*	..	*Ind.*
Newport ..	*The house of Barbara Williams.*	*10 Aug.*	*231*	..	*Ind.*
Shirenewton	*Thos. Quarrell at the house of John Maurice.*	*25 July*	*209*	..	*Congr.*
Undy ..	*The house of William Howells.*	*10 June*	*156*	..	*Ind.*

Mynyddislwyn, the euphonic name for a great Dissenting centre, has been very unworthily treated in the documents—'Monysly' and 'Monysley' (two contiguous entries on p. 187), 'Monycles' in the Jones transcript at the Bodleian,[1] 'Mynythystlayne' on p. 231, 'Mynythystloy' on p. 232 of the *Entry Book*, while the informer of 1669 wrote it as 'Minithisloyne'[2] and the summarised census of 1676 as 'Mymth Ystloine.'[3]

It was the very ordinary Christian name of *William* Milman that proved an unexpected stumbling-block: the Llangwm informer of 1669 only knew him as 'one Millman'[4]; the clerk of 1672 simply left a blank for 'William' when he made out an entry of the licence granted him on 25 July (p. 220).

As for the Baptist licences in North Monmouth, the official entries on pp. 231, 232, are explicit enough, e.g., John Edwards at his own house in Abergavenny, Thomas Jones at his own house in Bedwellty. But Spinther James came to the conclusion that John Edwards was to cross hill and dale to preach at the house of Thomas Jones.[5] This had the incidental result of reducing four licences into two.

1 *Jones MS.* 22, f. 33.
2 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 188.
3 *Salt MS.*, f. 418.
4 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 188b.
5 *Hanes y Bedyddwyr*, ii, 465-466; iii, 12.

For some unfathomable reason the licence to Thomas Barnes at Magor was issued twice over with no apparent disqualification in the first to account for the second (he is described as an Independent in the first and as a Congregational in the other). How two other licences mixed up the terms Presbyterian and Independent will come up for consideration at a later stage.

(vi) Pembroke.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Cilyerran ..	*Jenkin Jones at his own house.*	*8 May*	*85*	*Ejected Llanthetty, 1660.*	*Congr.*
Haverfordwest	*Peregrine Phillips at his own house; also*	*30 April*	*51*	*Ejected Llangwm and Freystrop, 1662.*	*Congr.*
	At the house of Richard Maylor.	*30 April*	*51*		*Congr.*
Uzmaston ..	*The house of Mark Gibbon.*	*10 June*	*173*	..	*Pr.*
„	*The house of John Phillips.*	*10 June*	*173*	..	*Pr.*

The nearest approach to Uzmaston on p. 173 is 'Usemaston' in one line and 'Utmaster' in the line next to it. Maylor is a variant for Meyler.

Passing over for the nonce the perplexing personality of Jenkin Jones, let us say something of the variegated career of Peregrine Phillips, the preacher who so impressed Cromwell that the latter asked him (at the time of the siege of Pembroke) to preach in one of his churches before the officers, and insisted on his 'putting up' a prayer on each of the ships that sailed from Milford for the reduction of Ireland. Calamy had come to know of his facility in both Welsh and English, of how he had preached in almost every church in the county of Pembroke, how he used to deliver assize-sermons in the three south-western counties; in the *Continuation* of the same *Account* he recounts Peregrine's marvellous deliverance (he and his horse) from a fall into one of the coal-pits of Freystrop. But it was Samuel Palmer in the *Memorial* who told the world of the public debates he figured in after the Restoration, of the offers made to him to conform, of the persecution he suffered under the penal code, of his wonderful recovery from a fever induced by one of his

imprisonments.[1] In the *Gordon MS.* it is related that just at the end of his life (in 1691) he lived on a rack-rented farm at Dredgmanhill, receiving from his congregation £8 a year, 'w^{n} y^{e} yeares and providence favours them, otherwise less.'[2] Not one of the Puritan leaders saw more of the vicissitudes of fortune than Peregrine Phillips.

(vii) Radnor.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Beguildy ..	*Maurice Griffith at his own house.*	*9 Dec.*	*277*	..	*Pr. Cong.*
„ ..	*Richard Griffith at his own house.*	*9 Dec.*	*277*	..	*Pr.*
„ ..	*Owen Morgan at his own house.*	*9 Dec.*	*280*	..	*Pr.*
Glasgwm ..	*Edward Owen as teacher.*	*18 Nov.*	*273*	..	*Congr.*
„ ..	*The house of Richard Mills.*	*18 Nov.*	*273*	..	*Congr.*
„ ..	*The house of Thomas Price.*	*18 Nov.*	*273*	..	*Congr.*
Llanbister ..	*John Hanmer as teacher.*	*18 Nov.*	*273*	..	*Congr.*
„ ..	*The house of Anne King.*	*18 Nov.*	*273*	..	*Congr.*
Llandrindod	*Wm. Greene at his own house.*	*3 F., 1673.*	*286*	..	*Bapt.*
Llanf. Nant Melan	*The house of Thomas Tonman.*	*18 Nov.*	*273*	..	*(No descr.)*
Llangunllo ..	*The house of Richard Griffith.*	*18 Nov.*	*273*	..	*Congr.*
New Radnor	*The house of John Weaver.*	*30 Sept.*	*255*	*Ejected Old and New Radnor, 1660.*	*Congr.*

This list is peculiar in more than one way: the lateness of the licences (not one before 30 September), a great proportion undated in the *Entry Book*, the strong Vavasorian element (four of his whilom followers appear), and the large number of licences granted to preachers and meeting-places with no definite terms of contact between them. Maurice Griffith was licenced twice over. Prof. Lyon Turner did not notice that Owen Morgan had a teacher's licence at all; he forgot in his summaries what he had written in his first volume.[3]

We have already read of John Hanmer acting as guide to Henry Maurice in his Brecknock-Radnor travels early in August 1672; years before he had been one of the most faithful henchmen of Vavasor Powell.

1 *Account* (1713), ii, 717; *Continuation*, ii, 843-844; *Noncon. Mem.* (1777), ii, 629-630; (1803), 507-508.
2 f. 94.
3 *O.R.*, ii, 1208; cp. i, 580.

XVI.

ORDINARY LICENCES: OVER THE BORDER.

These licences, it must be distinctly understood, were not included in the totals on p. 109, but they are interesting and important enough, on account of the proximity of some of them to the northern borders of Wales and the part taken by the great majority in the religious life of the principality during the Puritan interregnum, to demand separate recognition.

(i) Near the Dyke.

Place.	*Licence.*	*Date of Issue.*	*No. of Page in E.B.*	*Fortunes, 1660-1662.*	*Sect.*
Bettws-y-Crwyn.	*The house of Stephen Evans.*	*13 Jan., 72-73.*	*284*	..	*Pr.*
Bolas ..	*The house of Rowland Nevett.*	*18 Nov.*	*274*	..	*Pr.*
Milford ..	*John Brown at his own house.*	*22 May*	*134*	..	*Congr.*
Nantwich	*Robert Fogg at his own house; also*	*10 Aug.*	*235*	*Ejected Bangor-on-Dee, 1661.*	*Pr.*
	At the house of John King.	*15 June*	*186*	..	*Pr.*
Oswestry District.	*The house of Hugh Edwards.*	*25 July*	*217*	..	*Congr.*
	The house of Elizabeth Griffith.	*23 Dec.*	*282*	..	*Pr.*
	The house of Dorothy Gough 'at y^e^ Nant neare Oswistry.'	*23 Dec.*	*282*	..	*(No descr.).*
Shrewsbury	*James Quarrell at the King's Head.*	*22 May*	*134*	*Ejected Forden, 1660.*	*Congr.*
	Richard Swaine at his own house.	*5 Sept.*	*244*	*Ejected Clyro, 1662.*	*Pr.*
Sweeney ..	*Timothy Thomas at the house of Thos. Baker.*	*25 July*	*218*	*Ejected Morton, 1662.*	*Congr.*
Weston ..	*Rowland Nevett at his own house.*	*25 July*	*215*	*Ejected Oswestry, 1660.*	*Congr.*
[Much Wenlock [1].	*Henry Maurice at his own house.*	*5 Sept.*	*243*	..	*Congr.*
	The house of Edward King.	*5 Sept.*	*243*	..	*Congr.*
Acton Round	*Henry Maurice at the house of Edmund Symonds.*	*25 July*	*210*	..	*Congr.*
Church Stretton.	*The house of Widow Sankey.*	*25 July*	*210*	..	*Congr.]*

The fact that John Brown had once been a Commissioner for the Propagation in Wales, that Baker had also filled the

1 As this group have already been discussed, they are only inserted here for the sake of completeness.

same position, and that both Nevett and Swaine had been 'approvers' under that same Act—are sufficient to show how often their activities in the past had taken them west of the Dyke. According to Baxter, Swaine was for some time schoolmaster at Bridgnorth[1] (when, he does not say), but it is certain that he became Puritan minister of Clyro in Radnor after the expiry of the Propagation Act, and returned to his native Shrewsbury on his ejection therefrom in 1662. Quarrell had been an itinerant preacher in Vavasor's halcyon days, was one of the group of Puritans who defended the latter in the *Examen*, and had given somewhat timorous advice to Henry Maurice during his troublous days at Church Stretton.

Timothy Thomas introduces us to a trio of men with Biblical names—his brother Titus, ejected from Aston Chapel, and his friend Zechariah, ejected from Tilstock[2] (names which make us think inevitably of a similar trio of Scriptural Thomases who were connected with the church of Aberduar in the 18th century[3]). Timothy was a friend of Philip Henry's, married a daughter of the Dissenting stalwart John Evans of Wrexham, and became the father of Timothy Thomas of Pershore. Calamy (after James Owen, doubtless,) says the elder Timothy was chaplain to Mrs. Baker of Sweeney (at whose house he was licenced), a lady whose good qualities entitle her to a place by the side of Lady Puleston of Emral. There is no satisfactory evidence that any of these Thomases were Welshmen ; all that can be said is to state the probability of Timothy having been for a time Scholar of Jesus College in Oxford.[4]

Coming to the Oswestry district, two questions can be asked regarding Rowland Nevett : was his surname a Border corruption of the Welsh word *Ednyfed ;* and was he, like Samuel Jones of Llangynwyd, in the happy position of possessing two houses, one at Weston and one at Bolas Magna ? The *Entry Book* seems to answer the second in the affirmative. In recording the licence of Hugh Edwards, the clerk made the mistake of placing Oswestry in Denbighshire, and Prof. Lyon Turner overlooked him altogether in drawing

1 Calamy : *Contin.*, ii, 849.
2 Calamy : *Acct.*, ii, 564-565.
3 Joshua Thomas : *Hanes*, pp. 524-532.
4 *Bursary Book*, s.a. 1650-1651, pp. 180, 202.

up his Oswestry summaries.[1] As for Dorothy Gough of Nant, the Whitehall official clean forgot to say what 'persuasion' was to meet at her house, but as she is placed next on p. 282 to the Presbyterian Elizabeth Griffith, the wiser policy will be to make the two good women to be of the same denominational colour.[2]

Room must be made for a special paragraph on the most striking of all the Border characters, the Robert Fogg who had in former days been Puritan rector of the rich living of Bangor-on-Dee. Before the end of the Civil Wars he had survived many anxieties, of which the incident at the siege of Bolton (when Prince Rupert took 'particular aim' at him) was not the greatest: did not his wife turn out a Papist, and did not a stepson of his send the minister a challenge, only to be chastised by a sword which Fogg had surreptitiously hidden under his coat?[3] After the Restoration two of his sons, both ministers, fell away from the Puritan faith. At the time of his Nantwich licence, he was not far from 80 years of age, 'kept his coffin by him,' died in 1676 deeply mourned by Philip Henry, and was described as 'a poor silent Nonconformist' (active and prosperous though he had been in the days of his stubborn strength).[4] If Robert Fogg had been disposed to keep a diary, it would have been even fuller of moving dramatic interest than that of Philip Henry.

(ii) Further Afield.

Licencee.	*Old Sphere of Work in Wales.*	*Place at which Licenced.*	*Date.*	*Page in E.B.*	*Sect.*
Flower, Benjamin	*Cardiff*	*Chippenham* ..	*30 April*	*49*	*Pr.*
Griffith, George ..	[*Born in Montgomeryshire*]	*Addle Street, London.*	*22 April*	*43*	*Congr.*
Ives, Jeremiah ..	*Brecknock and Radnor.*	*Reading* ..	*5 Sept.*	*247*	*Bapt.*
Price, Charles ..	*Cardigan* ..	*Hammersmith* ..	*28 Oct.*	*267*	*Congr.*
Seale, George ..	*Cardiff*	*Marshfield (Glouc.).*	*22 July*	*200*	*Pr.*
Steele, Richard ..	*Hanmer*	*Westmoreland Ho., London.*	*2 April*	*5*	*Pr.*

1 *O.R.*, ii, 739.

2 One is inclined to ask whether the relations between Elizabeth Griffith and Dorothy Gough were not even closer than suggested by the *Entry Book*. Dorothy's house was 'at *ye Nant*'; *Nant* was one of the 'tai penna' in the district; and in the time of Edward Lhwyd its owner and occupier was William *Griffith* (*Rawlinson MS.* B. 464, f. 154; see also *Arch. Camb.*, Suppt., Apr. 1909, pp. 127-130).

3 Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 708; *Noncon. Mem.*, iii, 480-481.

4 *Diaries*, p. 273. Just thirty years previously he had received a £50 gratuity for bringing the news to London that Ruthin Castle had surrendered to the Parliament (Whitelock: *Memorials*, ii, 8).

With the exception of Griffith and Price, none of these were natives of Wales. They were immigrants from England who came west of the Border at varying times in the course of the Puritan Revolution to work either as preaching propagandists or as educational agents.

Benjamin Flower has suffered sadly from the inexactitudes of historians. Alexander Gordon says he held *some* post at Cardiff[1] (he was a settled minister there from about 1650 to the passing of the Act of September ten years later); Calamy stated that he and his father had the same names[2] (his father's name was Roger); the Anglican Edward Mansell, in letters forwarded in 1709 to Dr. John Walker to supply material for the *Sufferings*, put it that at the Restoration he returned to his native county of Gloucester (his native county was Wiltshire), and that as a temporary conformist he had a good benefice there[3] (only the curacy of Castle Combe under his father). Originally admitted to Christ's College in Cambridge, he was recommended to the Puritan Visitors at Oxford for a studentship in Christ Church, but there is no record that this recommendation went any further.[4] Nor is the time when he arrived at Cardiff known with any exactness: it is in 1655 that we read of his sanction by the Triers,[5] followed very soon after by arrangements concerning his salary by the Trustees for Maintenance.[6] The religious environment of Cardiff, accustomed as it was to the unconventional and irresponsible diatribes of its famous son Erbery, was not conducive to a minister's quiet life; in fact, Erbery's daughter Dorcas, having been converted into the ranks of the Quakers, was consigned to the Cardiff prison for 'disquietting' Flower's ministry on the Sabbath in the church of St. John the Baptist.[7] Let it be also remembered that a monoglot Englishman would be at some disadvantage in a district proved by one of the *Tanner MSS.* to be quite sensitive upon the claims of the Welsh language.[8] However, Flower's

1 *Freedom after Ejection*, pp. 265-266.
2 *Acct.*, ii, 763. It was from this source, presumably, Prof. Lyon Turner derived his 'Benjamin Flower, *junr.*' (*O. R.*, ii, 1056, 1062, 1063).
3 *MS. J. Walker*, c. 4, f. 67.
4 Montagu Burrows: *Register*, p. 206. This was in October 1648. The recommendation came from the London Committee for Regulation [of the two Universities].
5 *Lambeth Aug. Book* 968, f. 29.
6 *ib.*, 972, ff. 438-439; 977, f. 7.
7 *Extracts from St. Papers, . . .* ed. Penney, pp. 81-82. This happened in the summer of 1658.
8 Vol. 146, f. 147.

sojourn in Wales, even his conformist career in England from 1660 to 1662, only served to deepen his convictions as a Puritan: the returns of 1669 report him one of the most aggressive upholders of conventicles throughout Wiltshire[1]; when twenty years later the law smiled upon Dissenters once more, he is revealed full of evangelical enthusiasm in that county and the neighbouring Somerset.[2] In the year 1672 his case deserves the added notice that the junior James Innes entered on his behalf at Whitehall no less than four applications either for his own house, or for the use of the Chippenham Guild Hall.[3] The latter was refused. Nevertheless, Flower's name stands eighth out of the 22 Wiltshire ministers who were willing to send up to the King an address of thanks for the issue of the Indulgence.[4]

George Seale was also connected with Cardiff as a Puritan schoolmaster, doing duty there from May 1658 up to the Restoration, and deriving his annual salary of £40 from the tithes of Pendoylan (£8), Merthyr Mawr (£20), Knoylston and St. Hilary (£12).[5] In 1672 his licence agent was the redoubtable John Hickes. The application was put in on 10 May, and expressed a desire for entry into the 'parish house' of Marshfield. It was not until 22 July the licence was issued, with 'his howse' substituted for that in the application, and his name played upon to the tune of 'Seele' and 'Steele.'[6]

Charles Price had a more interesting history. Migrating to Cardigan from the Radnor rectory of Glasgwm (both of which he held under the Puritan powers),[7] he held the former living until the Restoration, and was one of those ministers to whom their present interests were sanctioned under the Great Seal of Charles II.[8] But he would not submit to the Act of Uniformity. Samuel Palmer says he retired to Hammersmith[9]; and the wording of his licence in 1672 is one of those instances where the dicta of that Nonconformist historian are borne out by official records, records to which he could not have access when revising the work of Calamy.

1 *Lambeth MS.* 639, ff. 238, 242, 244, 244b.
2 *Gordon MS.*, ff. 65, 82.
3 *S.P. 320*, 67, 68, 69, 70.
4 *ib.*, 160.
5 *Lambeth Aug. Books* 992, f. 126; 995, f. 541. See also Calamy's *Acct.*, ii, 732.
6 Cp. *S.P. 321*, 87, with *E.B.*, p. 200.
7 *H.P.M.*, p. 152.
8 *Pat. Rolls*, 13 Chas. II, pt. 47, No. 194.
9 *Noncon. Mem.*, iii, 496.

Jeremiah Ives was the famous General Baptist who introduced that gospel about 1646 to the highlands of the mid-Welsh Border.[1] In an age of controversy he was one of the nimblest controversialists. It is said that once the Merry Monarch invited Ives and a Romanist priest to fight out their differences in his presence ; the priest begged to be excused on finding that the Baptist was not in holy orders.[2] Coming to 1672, Lyon Turner has serious doubts whether the Reading entry refers to him at all, because of a discovery in Calamy's *Account* that a Thomas Juice after his ejection from the Worcester church of St. Nicholas moved to Reading.[3] The one answer to such doubts is to point out the difference between the *Jeremiah* of the licence and the *Thomas* of Calamy. It is certain that Ives was alive up to the days of the Popish Plot.[4]

Concerning Richard Steele, have not his doings been chronicled in the chapter on Licence Agents ?

In many respects the most prominent personality in all this group is George Griffith. Mention has already been made of his picturesque career—the hard grind of his early life in Montgomeryshire, his academic training at the two ancient Universities, the distinguished positions he was asked to fill during the Puritan régime (member of the first panel of Triers, official scribe of the Savoy Conference of Independents in 1658, preacher at the Charterhouse).[5] No Independent could possibly be more correct in deportment, more politic in outlook, than Griffith : he was one of the London Independents who signed a loyal address to King Charles in May 1660 ; he it was who stood by the side of Dr. John Owen on the morning of 28 March, 1672, to thank the same Charles for the Indulgence he had just granted.[6] Yet there was no minister of the period more fearless than he, more full of a fine spirit of self-abnegation. After the Great Fire he preached openly in the streets ; in the days of persecution he was continually sending sums of money to distressed nonconformists of all shades of opinion. Probably it was these qualities that in the old days endeared him to such a refractory and irrepressible character as Vavasor Powell.[7]

1 *H.P.M.*, p. 209.
2 *D.N.B.*, xxix, 80.
3 *O.R.*, iii, App. iv, 850 ; *Calamy :* Acct., ii, 769.
4 Dr. W. T. Whitley : *Hist. Brit. Baptists* (1923), p. 144.
5 *Religious Developments in Wales* (1923), see Index.
6 O.R., iii, 201, 596.
7 Francis Peck : *Desiderata Curiosa*, ii, 507-508. Letter of Powell to Griffith, 26 Aug., 1658.

XVII.

UNLICENCED SCHOOLS.

(i) **'Spite of Law and Coercion.'**

The Act of Uniformity not only banished from their churches those ministers who refused to declare their unfeigned consent and assent to the minutiæ of the Prayer Book, but by the combined force of clauses viii and xi it laid an interdict on the keeping of schools without licence[1]; it is sometimes forgotten that the Five Mile Act complemented the ostracism of the ministers from their old parishes by levying upon them a penalty of £40 for each offence of teaching in any public or private school or 'taking any boarders or tablers that are taught or instructed by them.'[2] It has been already shown how sec. 2 of the Declaration of 1672 made practically null and void clause iii of the Five Mile Act by tacitly allowing some of the exiled ministers to return to their old homes; did the same sec. draw the sting of clause iv and connive at the setting up of Dissenting schools (that is, not that the wording of the Declaration gave the slightest countenance to such schools, but that the relaxing atmosphere of the Indulgence made it impossible in practice to observe even the *un*suspended provisions of the penal code)? Unless the answer is in the affirmative, there seems no point in Archbishop Sheldon's letter to his suffragans (dated 6 February, 1672-1673, three days after the Cavalier Parliament reassembled), ordering them to proceed by the most effective remedies that may be against all who taught school 'publickly or privately' without the licence required by the Act.[3] The letter by implication proves the prevalence of such schools; its date, more

1 *Docts. Act Unif.*, ed. Gould, pp. 391, 393.
2 *ib.*, p. 490 (clause iv).
3 Cardwell: *Documentary Annals*, ii, pp. 286-287.

especially the fact that it was not written earlier ,suggests that it would be useless to write it in the heyday of the Indulgence.

This conclusion receives a startling support from the letter written to the Archbishop by Bishop Wm. Lucy in answer to the above encyclical.[1] In his sphere of supervision—'this Diocesse seemes to have sufferd more than any other'—the nonconformists had in their glosses upon the Indulgence outrun the most generous suggestions of Dr. Nicholas Butler. In spite of law and coercion, the Bishop says, schools have grown up in Brecon, Carmarthen, Haverfordwest, Swansea, Cardigan, 'and severall other places'; small stipends of £6 to £8 per annum are allowed to the teachers; women and excommunicated persons do the teaching; there is behind the whole movement substantial patrons and supporters. He adds information about Stephen Hughes denied to those who have hitherto essayed to trace his career, and inserts a special paragraph about John Weaver of New Radnor which will surprise the people who still fondly believe that Calamy is the final authority on the fortunes of nonconformists after the Restoration. The former, described as 'of Swansey,' had been excommunicated for 'teaching Schoole without license'; but the context, with its emphasis upon his present active preaching rather than upon his unlicenced schoolmastering, seems to push the date of excommunication back to a time preceding the Indulgence. "*There is at Bettus Disserth in Radnorshire one Weaver who keepes Schoole and preaches without licence, being long since* [(that is, before 1672-1673)] *Excommunicated for teaching Schoole*"—this is a very welcome sidelight on the career of that refractory Puritan, besides supplying confirmation of the *Entry Book* that only his *house* (and not himself as teacher) was licenced in 1672. So we must imagine Weaver for the nonce preacher and schoolmaster too, unlicenced as both, walking or riding every day to Diserth from his house at New Radnor (a distance of six to seven miles), and building up the younger section of the 188 sectaries found in that district in 1676.[2]

1 *Tanner MS.* 146, ff. 138-138v.
2 *Salt MS.*, f. 396.

(ii) The Man at the Window.

The unorthodox schoolmaster at Carmarthen deserves particular notice. By name James Picton, by conviction a Quaker. He first comes into view as master of the Puritan free school at Tenby under the Propagators and Triers.[1] He was won over by the Quaker crusade of 1657-1658: 'late schoolmaster there' is the testimony of the *Lambeth MS.* 980, f. 381, at the end of 1658. Like many hundreds of other Quakers Picton was caught in the vortex of the Restoration, and found himself an inmate of Carmarthen prison almost continuously from 1663 to 1672.[2]

He was no sooner released under the Indulgence than he began his old work of teaching, publicly and without licence. Such a challenge to the constituted authorities almost at the door of the episcopal palace of Abergwili could not be tolerated; the Mayor of Carmarthen, having been asked to put the Five Mile Act into operation (Picton not being a Puritan minister came under the 'any other person' of clause iv), and imprisoned him once again. With this sensational sequel: 'a Writ *de homine replegiando* was brought, the prison doores broken open, and he thus deliver'd by the rabble; keepes Schoole again in Despight of the Statute, has 70 or 80 Schollars, and an ingeniouse man schoolmaster of the [Anglican] Free schoole has not above 20 or 30.'[3] In a later letter the bishop devoutly hopes that such a case is not known anywhere else, for he knows not how to have it amended—'[it] tasts of too much violence to be suffer'd in any Commonwealth.'[4]

By the beginning of April Picton had been restored to his lodging again (they are the bishop's words), only to teach from there scholars who came crowding under the windows of the gaol.[5] And that is the last we hear in this context of James Picton the inexpugnable Quaker schoolmaster. Have the Society of Friends no artist who can do justice to

1 *H.P.M.*, p. 230.
2 *Extracts from St. Papers . . .* ed. Penney, pp. 345, 354.
3 *Tanner MS.* 146, ff. 138-138v. The name of the 'ingeniouse man' appears in a list of Anglican schoolmasters as 'Rice Jones, Clerke, Bch. of Artes' (*Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 336).
4 *Tanner MS.* 146, f. 113, postscript to a letter written from Brecon on 20 Feb., 1672-1673.
5 *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 40 (dated 3 April, 1673).

the Carmarthen school of 1673 and the schoolmaster at the prison window ?

(iii) Surmises.

Picton and Carmarthen are the only two where person and place are definitely associated by the Bishop. One can only surmise that Henry Maurice—once not unconnected with the Bottwnog endowment[1]—taught at Brecon and Peregrine Phillips at Haverfordwest, there being no certain corroborative evidence. James Davies at Cardigan and William Thomas at Swansea—he being an M.A. of Jesus College, Oxford, and ejected from the living of St. Mary Church in 1661—can be put down with more confidence, since Calamy in the case of Davies does say he kept school for some time, and not only chronicles a tradition that Thomas acted as schoolmaster but definitely connects him with Swansea.[2]

As for the ' severall other places ' where Dissenters set up schools, there are only a few candidates ; these have to be searched for either in the folios of the *Gordon MS.*, or in the *Account* of Calamy, or in the later traditions of the *Nonconformist Memorial.* Rice Protheroe of Ystradwalter is supported by Calamy and the MS.[3] ; David Jones, once of Llanbadarn in Cardigan, in the *Memorial* only.[4] In neither case is there convincing proof that they evaded the Five Mile Act in 1672-1673. It is unfortunate that the letter in the *Tanner MSS.* and all other examined sources are silent about the names of the *women teachers* the Bishop so piquantly refers to (it may be said here that the framers of the Five Mile Act had not been oblivious of this development by inserting the words ' or herself ' in the teaching restrictions of clause iv).

Stepping oustide the bounds of St. David's, there must have been several old schoolmasters of the Puritan régime still living : who can say but that the former Magor schoolmaster Milman, busy in teaching adult conventiclers in 1669,

1 The writer is not so certain on this point as in the *Religious Developments* (pp. 66-67). The argument there rested on a petition of 1656 found in the State Papers and signed by Henry Morris. Since then a Henry (Harry) Morris has been found in 1661 delivering over two cases of pistols to the Carnarvonshire authorities (*N.L.W. MS.* 3071E, f. 70). The probability is that these two were the same man, Maurice the minister quite another. As the preacher was in 1661 a respectable beneficed clergyman, it is not easy to see how *he* could be handing over cases of pistols to the disbanding deputies.

2 *Acct.*, ii, 720 (Davies), 731 (Thomas).

3 *ib.*, 720 ; *Gordon MS.*, f. 94.

4 iii., 496.

did not fill out his licence in 1672-1673 by teaching some of the young nonconformists of Netherwent as well ?

(iv) Samuel Jones.

Much has been written from time to time about the activities of Samuel Jones and his academy for young ministers at Brynllywarch. In the MS. discovered at Dr. Williams' Library in 1912 and edited by Alexander Gordon in 1917 he is described as one who ' teachth Lerning '[1] ; one very poor student is referred to as ' perfecting with Loggick ' with him ; three other hopeful young men (one a son of Stephen Hughes) are also put down as ' now in a way of Education for the ministry with Mr. Samuel Jones Pembrookshire '[2] (evidently the Indulgence clerk was not the only London scribe who fell into this geographical absurdity). All this, however, was after the Toleration Act of 1689.

Dr. Thomas Rees, followed by a host of other writers, is of opinion that the academy came into being soon after the Restoration,[3] a consummation unthinkable in face of the double stringency of the Bartholomew and Five Mile Acts. According to a very valuable work on dissenting academies published by Irene Parker in 1914, Jones had started work in 1668[4] ; but she gives no authority for her statement. Is it possible that the lynx-eyed informer of 1669 would have nothing to say of such illegal teaching activities in his report to the Bishop of Llandaff ?

During 1672-1673, however, it is highly probable that Samuel Jones did manage to open school in addition to fulfilling the calls of his far-flung licences ; it is at this juncture that room is made for the coming to him of James Owen (Calamy's informant, then about 18 years of age), a coming attested by the *Account* of 1713.[5] This same *Account* has it that members of the Mansell family had their education at Brynllywarch. It is open to serious doubt whether such could be true of any period before 1688 : was it not from Margam, the seat of the Mansell family, a warrant was issued in August 1684 to apprehend Samuel Jones (and others) as men excommunicate ? But it remains likely that it was the

1 f. 94.
2 f. 95.
3 *Hist. Prot. Noncon.* (1883 ed.), p. 493.
4 App. I, p. 137.
5 ii, 721.

freedom of the Indulgence that first suggested the idea of a nonconformist seminary to the sometime Fellow and Bursar of Jesus.

(v) North Welshmen.

In North Wales the letters of the two bishops in answer to Sheldon's inquiries have not been discovered. There the schoolmasters are all surmise. But it is supremely likely that John Evans of Wrexham, once Puritan schoolmaster at Oswestry, found the old work too tempting to forgo : there is a tradition that gentlemen of considerable rank sent their sons to him in later days of persecution.[1] The same law of analogy would apply to another old schoolmaster in the person of Richard Jones of Denbigh ; and if we assume Samuel Jones busy in the south, on a similar assumption Jonathan Roberts opened his doors for scholars at Llanfair in Dyffryn Clwyd—he also being sometime Fellow of Jesus. When did the wife of Ellis Rowlands keep a girls' school in Carnarvonshire, while Ellis drew patterns for the girls to work by ?[2]

Two other characters have claims for admission. Three years before 1672 Reginald Wilson of Aberhafesb was definitely described as ' schoolmaster ' and an abettor of two conventicles in Cydewain[3] ; fortunately, Joshua Thomas has preserved the story that he was a man of good education (designed, indeed, at one time for the ministry of the Church of England), and kept a large school where he, like Samuel Jones and in a lesser degree John Evans, trained up the sons of gentlemen of quality, some of them even preparing for preferments in the national Church.[4] In Wilson's case again, no conclusive proof of schoolmastering activity in Indulgence times is forthcoming ; but the Anglican informer and the Baptist historian between them put together strong links of presumptive evidence. Then there is Ambrose Lewis, once master of the Wrexham Puritan free school (probably the most flourishing in Puritan Wales)[5] who conformed at the Restoration, and was deposed from master to usher. Nevertheless, he kept up his old friendship with Philip Henry,

1 *Noncon. Mem.*, iii, 523.
2 *ibid.*, iii, 478.
3 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 139. ' Aberhawst ' in MS.
4 *Hanes*, p. 289.
5 *H.P.M.*, p. 226 : *Religious Developments* (1923), pp. 58, 61.

and in 1681 was charged before Judge Jeffreys at the assizes of Denbigh with keeping a conventicle in the school, 'by which means your children get the twang of fanaticism in their noses when they are young.'[1] With these antecedents and associations, cast in this milieu, is it not more than probable that he heard the call of the old faith in 1672? Apposite in this context are the two facts that on 8 September, 1670, Philip Henry stayed with Lewis at Wrexham, and that the so-called Anglican schoolmaster was then 'keeping and teaching' the son of an ejected minister of Salop.[2]

(vi) A List of Schools.

Transmuting surmises into certainties, applying to 1672 the advantages of prior and posterior evidence, and not forgetting the all-important letter of Bishop Lucy, we arrive at this provisional list of Dissenting schoolmasters in 1672-1673.

Name.	*Place.*	*Name.*	*Place.*
Davies, James ..	*Cardigan.*	*Picton, James* ..	*Carmarthen.*
Evans, John ..	*Wrexham.*	*Protheroe, Rice*	*Ystradwalter.*
Jones, David[3] ..	*Pencarreg.*	*Roberts, Jonathan*	*Llanfair D.C.*
Jones, Richard ..	*Denbigh.*	*Rowlands, Ellis (wife of).*	*Caernarvon.*
Jones, Samuel ..	*Llangynwyd.*	*Thomas, William*	*Swansea.*
Lewis, Ambrose	*Wrexham.*	*Weaver, John* ..	*Bettws Diserth.*
Maurice, Henry	*Brecon.*	*Wilson, Reginald*	*Aberhafesb.*
Milman, William	*Llangwm.*		
Phillips, Peregrine	*Haverfordwest.*		

It is quite possible that fresh evidence will disqualify some of these entries. It is equally possible, and more probable, that further research will add rather than take away. The losses will be more than made up.

(vii) The Charity Movement.

It now behoves us to inquire to what extent Bishop Lucy's letter is describing the earlier activities of the Gouge educational movement in Wales. In his contemptuous strictures on the Londoner's efforts—in a letter dated 10 August, 1676—Bishop Humphrey Lloyd of Bangor

1 A. N. Palmer: *Hist. Older Nonconformity of Wrexham*, p. 37. It is said that the notorious Judge had once been a pupil of Lewis.

2 *Diaries*, p. 230 (both references). 'This kindness,' says Henry, 'I am concern'd to acknowl. & requite.'

3 It is on the assumption that Jones of Pencarreg was once at Llanbadarn he is put down here. In other words, the theory of Gordon is gaining ground on that of Lyon Turner (*supra*, pp. 115-116).

tells Sheldon he had been informed that Gouge was in the habit of making an annual visitation to Wales 'for 4 yeares last past'[1]; and Dr. John Tillotson in the funeral sermon of 1681 has it that the same worthy man had devoted his charity to Wales 'for about nine or ten years last past'[2]: between them dating its inception in 1671-1672. Mr. Shankland, a very high authority, places it definitely in the latter year.[3] As there is considerable evidence that it was Stephen Hughes who had the constructive mind to range the native energies of Wales behind the benevolence of Gouge's appeal, it is highly natural to search for the results of this benevolence in the diocese of St. David's (more than one half of the list just given fell within its area); it is very suggestive also to compare the women teachers of Lucy's letter in 1673[4] with the schoolmistresses of Lloyd's diatribe of 1676. As regards the salary of both sexes of teachers, the allusions of the two bishops differ: 'small stipends' of £6 or £8 in St. David's, 'fortie shillings in a place' in Bangor (dropped here and there by Gouge himself, according to Dr. Humphrey Lloyd). The collation can be carried further to compare the 'greate purses' who supported the South Wales dissenting schools[5] with the 'weaker gentrie' who were adventured upon (Bishop Lloyd's phrase) in the North. It is quite certain that neither Gouge's generosity nor the teachers' poverty would for long remain satisfied with the original wage of a penny or two pence a week.[6]

Lucy tells the interesting news that in these schools the children were instructed in factious catechisms 'given them in charge by their patrons and supporters'; not only schoolmasters, but the preachers (licenced and unlicenced), are accused of dispersing their principles among the people by papers and books. Were Gouge and his Welsh friends the patrons and supporters? Did the catechisms refer to the *Assembly's Catechism* published in Welsh in 1664, or to the catechism of William Perkins translated into Welsh for

1 *Tanner MS.* 40, ff. 18-18v. This remark occurs in the postscript.
2 Quoted in Dr. Thos. Rees: *Hist. Prot. Noncon.*, p. 200.
3 *Beirniad*, Oct. 1912, p. 179.
4 *Tanner MS.* 146, f. 138.
5 *ib.*, f. 113 (postcript).
6 Gouge's friend Samuel Clark is the authority for this (*Lives of Eminent Persons*, 1683, i, 204). Alexander Gordon says 1d. or 2d. a week *per scholar* (*D.N.B.*, xxii, 270). That might be common-sense and might be Clark's inner meaning, but Clark does not say so.

the third time by Stephen Hughes in 1672, or to the translation of the *Whole Duty of Man* published under the auspices of Gouge and Hughes in 1672 ? The latter translation, coupled with a treatise on 'particular piety,' was sold at 3/6, and 2,000 copies were distributed gratis in 1672.[1] A veritable *annus mirabilis*, this year 1672.

It is to be hoped that the zeal of Bishop Lucy against Dissent and the Indulgence did not make him include in the 'factious catechisms' the new Welsh translation of the New Testament brought out by Stephen Hughes in the same year. Was he aware that the benevolent but 'excommunicate' nonconformist was seconded in that venture not only by Samuel Jones of Llangynwyd, but by the Precentor of St. David's, and by the conformist Puritans Hugh Edwards of Llangadog and William Lloyd of St. Petrox in Pembrokeshire ?[2] Even the sour-lipped Dr. Michael Roberts of Oxford, an erstwhile Puritan Principal of Jesus to whom the memory of anything Puritan was now anathema, does condescend to refer to this translation of the Testament 'in our Native language' (adding his natural regret that the Prayer Book had not been incorporated with it, and forgetting to say a word of Stephen Hughes by name).[3] And if Dr. William Roberts, one of Lloyd's predecessors at Bangor, had been willing to lend his name as patron to the polyglot concordance of a don ejected from Cambridge because of his nonconformity,[4] surely Lucy ought to support some of his own clergy in pushing forward a Welsh translation of the New Testament, even though the work was edited by an ejected minister. Far otherwise : his letter to Sheldon gives the unmistakable impression that he was lying in wait for Stephen Hughes with a *de excomm. cap.* Indulgence or no Indulgence, that Bishop was evidently bent on living up to the words written later as his epitaph—

veritatis et Orthodoxiæ vindex acerrimus.[5]

1 *Beirniad*, Oct. 1912, pp. 180, 182. Samuel Clark (*Lives*, i, 205) undoubtedly gives the impression that this book was brought out under the influence of Gouge. G. J. Williams has strong grounds for a contrary opinion (*Y Cofiadur*, iv, 27-28).

2 *Gwaith Mr. Rees Prichard* (1672 ed.), letter prefixed [1]. Dr. Wm. Thomas the Precentor had given a good testimony to Hughes under his own hand ('dan eich llaw'). Lloyd had originally been appointed to St. Petrox by the Puritan Triers, and was re-admitted to the living by Bp. Lucy on 1 Oct., 1662. The facts about Edwards are not quite so clear.

3 *Panton Papers* (N.L.W.), O. III, 16 (letter to Dr. Robert Morgan, Bishop of Bangor, dated 10 Dec., 1672).

4 Calamy : *Continuation*, ii, 807-809.

5 Theophilus Jones : *Hist. Breck.*, ii (1809), Pt. II, p. 749.

Though these considerations—the context of the Bangor letter of 1676 (specifically referring to Gouge and his work), the St. David's account of 1673 (in which his actual name is never so much as mentioned[1]), Lucy's references to the persistent dissemination of catechisms—point very conclusively to the early career of the Charity Schools, it would be rash with our present knowledge to force *all* the schools even on Lucy's list into a direct dependence upon the London movement. For our immediate purpose it is sufficient to record the conviction that the attractive freedom of the Indulgence developed Gouge's plans and hastened their resolution into practice. The early seed (there cannot be reasonable doubt) was urged to fruition by the literary licence agent who has been termed 'the apostle of Carmarthenshire.'

As for the internal economy of these schools, it is useless to dogmatise amidst an almost complete lack of contemporary evidence. It is too early to apply to them the academic standard of the post-1689 institutions described by Alexander Gordon,[2] or the more detailed account given by Irene Parker in the second chapter of her work on *Dissenting Academies*.[3] John Harris studying 'Loggick' at Brynllywarch brings the academy of Samuel Jones into line with those advanced Dissenting schools which laid such emphasis on a sound knowledge of Philosophy. That was in 1691, not 1672. And the likelihood is that the majority of the Welsh schools were engaged in work much more elementary than training young ministers. We must be satisfied with deducing from the testimony of his friend and contemporary Samuel Clark that the basic axioms of Gouge's system of education for children were—the English language as medium, the segregation of the sexes, no fees, concentration upon reading, writing, and 'casting accompts,' all to be done against a background of moral suasion and the principles of religion.[4]

1 Unless he be one of the unnamed 'seminary's of the Dissenting party' referred to in *Tanner MS.* 146, f. 138.
2 *Freedom after Ejection*, p. 182.
3 pp. 54-123.
4 *Lives*, 1683, i, 204-205. "A Man for the Boys, and a Woman for the Girls."

NOTE: *THE GENESIS OF A GREAT IDEA.*

It is usual to quote the passage in Clark's *Life of Joseph Alleine* (1671, p. 33) which tells of the interest taken by that pious Taunton pastor in the sad state of the 'poor Welch,' and to emphasise Clark's later account (*Lives*, 1683, 141-142) of how the reading of this passage by Thomas Gouge inflamed his zeal and made his spirit so restless, as to come to the sudden conclusion of Mr. Shankland's theory. Curiously enough, hardly any have cared to inquire into the reasons underlying this strange obsession of Alleine's, to remember the short sojourn at Taunton (about 1657) of Samuel Jones of Llangynwyd (Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 721), and recollect that visit of Alleine's to Bath, where, we are told by Clark, he was comforted by ministers from Bristol, men who were at all times thoroughly conversant with the lot of Welshmen on the other side of the Severn Channel (*Lives*, 154). However, that paragraph in the *Life* of 1671, interesting though it is in itself and still more interesting as a study in spiritual genealogy, hardly seems moving enough to have caused the wonderful perturbation in the mind of Gouge. His mind must assuredly have been already prepared by conversations with some such person as George Griffith of the Charterhouse, who as Puritan Trier had stocked his native county of Montgomery with Puritan ministers, or have received a visit from Vavasor Powell on some of the mysterious peregrinations which the great Welsh millenarian and supporter of the erstwhile Puritan free schools was allowed to make from his prison in the Fleet. For a very careful analysis of the relations between Stephen Hughes and Thomas Gouge, and for a new angle to examine the probable date of the inception of Gouge's ideas into Wales (a second genesis not yet satisfactorily traced), read Mr. G. J. Williams' article in *Y Cofiadur*, iv, 20-27; for some conflict of interpretation between him and Mr. Shankland over certain passages in the letter prefixed by Hughes to the 1672 edition of Vicar Prichard's work, cp. the aforesaid pages with *Y Beirniad*, 1912, pp. 181-182. The *Cofiadur* reasoning would be more satisfactory if Mr. Williams had quoted Stephen's words in full instead of leaving out just that passage italicised in the *Beirniad* which Mr. Shankland thought most relevant to his argument.

XVIII.

WELSH PRESBYTERIANS.

(i) Frustrated Ideals.

Southern Britain proved an unfortunate field for organised Presbyterianism. The classical system which was imposed upon the Long Parliament by the exigencies of the First Civil War had hardly been made compulsory in 1646 before it was made permissive by the collapse of the Second in 1648. Without the support of the State it gradually fell into decay, and individual Presbyterians were left either to plot against the republic (the Cardiff-born Christopher Love had to go to the scaffold for such activities), or to pray that the restoration of the King would not come until the old episcopal order had all died out.[1] Occasionally, as in 1654, efforts were made to agree with the Independents about fundamentals of belief.[2] More often the Presbyterians found their churches—'the public churches'—filled with strange congregations who had no love for Presyterian polity, and who used the buildings as convenient meeting-places for members of the 'gathered' churches.[3] Thus deprived of the secular might of the civil arm, a voluntary Presbyterian system took deep root in London and Lancashire; as for Wales, it is doubtful if the Puritanism of the Principality ever brought forth a finer flower than the multifarious but compactly co-ordinated energies of Philip Henry and his associates in the enclave of English Flint. Even in the Cromwellian strongholds of East Anglia, and that in 1658, the Presbyterians of Bury St. Edmunds were able to monopolise the two parish churches and to coop up in a corner the Independents of the town, compelling them to meet in an obscure cold place, to the hazard of their lives in the winter season.[4]

1 G. B. Tatham: *Puritans in Power*, pp. 248-249.
2 Dr. W. A. Shaw: *Hist. Eng. Church*, ii, 86-89.
3 *ib.*, ii, 132-133.
4 *O.R.*, iii, 411-412 (see documents quoted).

The march of Monck to London early in 1660 carried with it the promise of an early return to the system undermined twelve years before ; in March the restored Long Parliament, originally ' purged ' because its majority was Presbyterian, decided that J.P.'s were to assist in dividing Southern Britain once more into classical presbyteries[1] ; and at one time, by Charles II's declaration of October 1660, there was an imminent probability of permeating on comprehensionist principles the whole Anglican polity with the Scoto-Genevan model.[2] Modified Episcopacy became the ideal of Baxter and the elder Calamy. But the inexorable march of events decreed otherwise. The promises of Breda never fructified ; the declaration of October never became law ; by the summer of 1661 the Savoy conference with the bishops ended ingloriously in angry recriminations. There was now nothing for it but to sit down like defeated men and see the Act of Uniformity passing with mechanic precision through its various stages. 24 August, 1662, was followed in due course by 1 July, 1664, when the first Conventicle Act came into force. Classis, synod and the whole delicate interdependent hierarchy of assemblies which marked out the Presbyterian polity as the most symmetrical structure of church-government ever devised in these islands, could not live under the Clarendon Code. That quasi-complete system of *representation*—the internal expedient to bind together the separated presbyteries —was in practice made impossible by the ubiquity of spies and the pikes of the soldiers. While the ' dead ' clauses of the Act of Uniformity proved a deadlier menace to the Presbyterians (wedded as they were to fixed geographical precincts) than to the more resilient polity of the Independents, the operation of clause iii of the Five Mile Act emphasised still further the separation from old flocks.

More than this, the ambition of the Presbyterian in 1660 and 1661 to oust other Puritans from the paradise of comprehension in the national fold compromised him in turn as a spokesman of the minority in the days of persecution : the desire for terms with the bishops, the technical interpretation of the Oxford Oath which allowed a loophole for the

1 *Cal. St. Pap.*, 1659-1660, p. 392 (14 March).
2 Cardwell : *Documentary Annals*, ii, 235-250.

'dons'[1] to accept it, and the ever-recurring interviews of the same men with the King and his ministers, paralysed their energies as a fighting force. They fought for privilege at the expense of Puritan solidarity. Extremer men flourished while the Presbyterians were hanging around Whitehall. Were not the Quakers riding fearlessly across country in the face of two Conventicle Acts, was not the church of Cilfwnwr organised in the midst of the terrors of the Act of 1664, and did not the Baptists of Rhydwilym first foregather in 1667-1668? Militant Puritanism was not going to wait for the 'dons.'

(ii) "Growing to Independents."

Worse than all, the pressure of the Code had fast transferred Presbyterians into Independents, the one party and polity with which they had waged incessant war since the days of the Westminster Assembly. Long before 1669 the Presbyterians of Bury St. Edmunds had had to leave the two parish churches, gather secretly in private houses, occasionally visiting the barn of Susanna Adams—and all this in company with those Independents whom once they had forced to pray and preach in unhealthy corners.[2] In fact, about *fifteen* other cases occur in the conventicle returns of that year where whilom opponents worshipped under one roof (of which the Hackney concordat was the most sensational that reached the ears of the informers[3]). A close examination of the licence documents of 1672 will reveal nearly a *dozen* instances where permission was asked and given *for Presbyterians and Congregationalists to attend the same meeting-places.* In this class the application of David Clarkson of Mortlake in Surrey sounds very quaint: 'the meeting consists of both . . . and both are at the charg of all, & to appropriate it to either, will be counted a p'iudice to the other.'[4]

To return to 1669, a Canterbury informer describes one teacher, once a Presbyterian, 'now Independent' (unfortunately for his information, that teacher called himself

1 This term was applied to the more cautious and conservative school of Presbyterians, of whom Drs. Bates, Jacomb, and Manton were the chief members. The younger and more adventurous section were nicknamed 'ducklings.' Samuel Annesley, Janeway, and the two Vincent brothers took the lead in their counsels (*O.R.*, iii, 201).

2 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 231.

3 *ib.*, f. 223.

4 *S.P. 320*, 188—'for Mr. Matthew Shephard [licence agent] in Clemens Lane, London.'

Presbyterian again in 1672[1]); better authenticated cases of secession are those of Isaac Chauncey of Andover (brother to Ichabod Chauncey and son of an old President of Harvard), and John Lucas of Norwich.[2] Even in Cardiganshire we are assured by Palmer that David Jones of Llanbadarn and Evan Hughes of Cellan were once ordained by Presbyters, and by Henry Maurice in 1675 that the Independents of this county were 'very moderate'[3]; notwithstanding this double testimony, both Jones and Hughes preferred to be 'Congregational' in the licences of 1672. In one of the State Papers and that under the year 1664, the unexpected news is broached that some Presbyterians (two names are given) had turned Baptists, if not Quakers.[4] These inroads upon the Presbyterian preserves were not likely to escape the keen ears of Sir Joseph Williamson. He states it as a general axiom in 1671 that fanaticism was moving further to the left and Presbyterians 'growing to Independents.'[5]

Very naturally the Congregational bias of Professor Lyon Turner fastened upon these and cognate facts to say that the Presbyterians of 1672 were Presbyterians in theory or inclination only and had perforce to be Independents in their actual administration of the churches to which they ministered, that with the disruption of the synodical system they had become 'gathered churches' like the rest.[6] Alexander Gordon in his usual pungent manner puts it that Presbyterian organisation now existed *in particular congregations only*, which is saying the same thing as Lyon Turner in another way.[7] A. A. Seaton virtually agrees with them by his remark that 'Presbyterian' at the Restoration [and more surely *after*] was merely an innocuous term used to describe a party which represented the old Puritan Churchmen.[8] To these distinguished writers Presbyterianism had been reduced *ad absurdum*. The Act of Uniformity had closed against it the doors of the National Church; the code of Clarendon had sold it into the hands of its Puritan enemies.

1 Cp. *Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 154, with *S.P. 321*, 258, and *E.B.*, p. 164.
2 *O.R.*, iii, 321-322 (Chauncey), 426 (Lucas).
3 *Noncon. Mem.*, iii, 496; *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 512.
4 *Extracts from St. Paps. . . . ed.* Penney, pp. 192-193 (quoting *S.P.D.*, Chas. II, Vol. 99, 7).
5 *C.S.P.*, 1671, p. 496. It would be more correct to say it was the conclusion come to by 'intelligencers' working under his orders.
6 *O.R.*, i, Preface, xvii; iii, 29, 730-731.
7 For his whole argument, see *Freedom after Ejection*, pp. 151-154.
8 *Theory of Toleration*, p. 106 (n. 1).

(iii) Abiding Convictions.

To another band of writers, curiously enough and conversely enough, Puritanism itself is synonymous with Presbyterianism. *Solus Calvinus regnat.*[1] The virulent Oxford antiquary, Anthony Wood, concentrated his fire against the 'damned presbytery'; the third chapter of Canon Vernon Staley's biography of Sheldon refers to Presbyterians as if Baptists and Independents had ceased to be, even saying that the *Presbyterians* were in power all the time from 1642 to 1660[2]; the same one-eyed obsession with the term 'presbyterian' deprives the articles of the American W. C. Abbott of much of their historical value.[3] Such an attitude is as uncritical as the Gordon-Turner view is incomplete. One instinctively feels that the latter drive the case against Presbyterians much too far. Are we really to believe with the Bishop of Bristol in 1669 who in cryptic Latin declared to his brother of Gloucester that Independents and Presbyterians were *mutuos se possunt et tollunt*?[4] It must be readily admitted with Gordon that all congregations of Puritans were under the circumstances autonomous, all non-parochial, a state of things abhorrent to all good Presbyterians. But does he represent the full truth when he says the term 'Presbyterian' had become a mere verbal repudiation of the condition of chaos into which ecclesiastical matters had fallen on the failure of the Parliament's Presbyterian experiment of 1646-1648? Surely no writer of our time is better aware that out of every 21 licences granted in 1672 13 were down deliberately as Presbyterian,[5] that out of 1600 ministers licenced 939 were Presbyterian, that out of the full total of 4,173 licences 2,600 (roughly) were of that persuasion.[6] Does he really think that all these 939 ministers took refuge in mere negation and called themselves 'Presbyterian' simply because they were afraid of the unsatisfactory political odour associated with the word 'Independent'?

It is next to impossible to accept such a theory. The

1 A remark occurring in a letter written on 22 July, 1669, by the Bishop of Bristol to the Bishop of Gloucester (Dolben Papers—*Bodl. Add. MS.* c. 302, f. 178).

2 See esp. p. 78.

3 *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxi, p. 29 (art.—'Long Parliament of Charles II').

4 *Bodl. Add. MS.* c. 302, f. 178.

5 It is important, however, to remember the terminological mistakes of the Whitehall clerks (see next section).

6 For these numbers, *O.R.*, iii, 732-735, must be examined.

logic of fact and the pressure of opinion both fight against it. Did not the Presbyterians of Bristol, even in those difficult days that followed the final revocation of the Indulgence (days somewhat more difficult in that city than anywhere else)—did they not stand in the way of a real union among the Dissenters by saying that they wanted no one to preach but those ordained by presbyters and bred up at a University ?[1] In that highly convivial meeting held at Chiffinch's nine years after the Indulgence was published, attended by the King in person and (with others) by Mytton Davies of Gwysaney, toasts were drunk to the extirpation of Popery 'and Presbytery too,'[2] an addendum unnecessary if we are to believe Presbyterianism thoroughly emasculated and a negligible factor in the State. A few years after that, from 1683 to 1685, at a time when the policy of persecution was re-applied with great persistency, a brave effort was made by emissaries from the Great Elector of Brandenberg to induce wealthy Presbyterians of London to emigrate to West Prussia : not only did those particular Presbyterians show themselves the keenest of commercial bargainers, but (what is more relevant to the argument) evinced an inexpugnable desire to preserve abroad their own ecclesiastical discipline and be allowed the maintenance of two pastors at the Elector's own expense.[3] That potentate was left in no doubt about Presbyterian virility. And when Gordon comes to deal with the 'happy union' of London Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the early days of the Toleration Act, and with a 'common fund' established for the sustenance of poor ministers in the city and country, he has to recount too how that union did not remain happy for long nor the fund common[4]—all Presbyterians had not grown Independent after all.

Moving forward to the reign of Queen Anne—the further we move the stronger the argument—we find the third Calamy (the author of the *Abridgement* and the *Account*) as much of a Presbyterian as his father and grandfather, a bias that told rather heavily against the remote sectaries of Wales, and made

1 *Broadmead Recs.* (ed. Haycroft), pp. 98, 115, 119.
2 Henry Taylor : *Hist. Notices of Flint*, pp. 146-147 (letter of Davies to Thomas Edwards of Rhual, dated 12 March, 1680-1681).
3 *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxv, esp. pp. 102-107 (art. by Professor O. H. Richardson on 'Religious Toleration under the Great Elector').
4 *Freedom after Ejection*, pp. 154-158.

him devote his longest notices to undoubted Presbyterians. He is the same Presbyterian Calamy in his *Continuation* of 1727. Years before that a somewhat invertebrate writer, in giving to the world once more the arguments used by the Presbyterian spokesmen at the Savoy Conference of 1661, would have it that their followers were still (in 1708) the most considerable body of Dissenters in the land.[1] Without laying too much stress on the words of this Presbyterian apologist, it can be confidently asserted (notwithstanding the Whitehall traffickings of their leaders) that Presbyterians in 1672 were not the Laodicean disciples Gordon and Turner would have us believe. As for Seaton, his remark at the foot of p. 106 is effectively rebutted by his statement in the text of p. 183 that the innocuous Presbyterians became bold enough under the Declaration to hold their first ordinations since the days of the interregnum.[2] And how is it that none of these writers has seen prudent to say a word of Edward Reyner of Lincoln, a prominent divine of the Congregational way whose criticisms of its demerits made him practically a Presbyterian ?[3]

Not so dissimilar in type was John Weaver of New Radnor, the strong man of tenacious memory and taciturn temper at whose house Congregationals came to hear the Word in 1672, but who only three years later is described in Maurice's letter as a Presbyterian, and associated very closely by Samuel Palmer with George Primrose of Hereford and Sir Edward Harley of Brampton Bryan, men essentially moderate and known Presbyterians.[4] Though Maurice's spelling of his surname is not too clear (it looks like ' Weans '), there is not much doubt what minister he is referring to. He distinctly says he cannot give any account of the officers of the church ruled by the Radnorshire preacher : was it likely that the Independent Maurice down in Brecknock would be so disinterested in Weaver if the latter were any sort of an Independent ? The fact that no licence was entered for Weaver himself, and that a Congregational licence was allowed for his house, is one of the unsolved mysteries. According to Maurice, the James Davies who was licenced at Cardigan

1 *The History of Non-Conformity As it was Argued . . . in 1661* (sec. ed., 1708, preface).
2 The references are to two pages of his work on the *Theory of Toleration*.
3 Calamy : *Acct.*, ii, 443-445.
4 Cp. *E.B.*, p. 255, with *Broad. Recs.*, p. 518, and *Noncon. Mem.*, iii, 509.

and Cenarth was a moderate Presbyterian, 'for anything I know.'[1] From no other source come any facts to support this qualified opinion. In any case, historical truth demands as much prominence for half-hearted Independents as for quasi-Presbyterians. If many Presbyterians were growing to Independents, some Congregationals were hardly distinguished from Presbyterians.

(iv) The Whitehall Clerks Again.

The Presbyterians of Wales in 1672 cannot be discussed with any degree of certainty without some attention being paid to another problem—the careless sect-descriptions given in the licence-documents of the London clerks and the allied inaccuracies of some of the licence agents. It is often impossible to place the blame on the right shoulders. As for the Whitehall officials, from the Earl of Arlington down to the porter referred to in one of Dr. Butler's letters, the spectacle is presented of an instrument of religious toleration being manipulated by materially-minded men.

Carelessness faces us everywhere. Even Benson, the most responsible of all the clerks, confused St. Mary Ottery in Devon with St. Mary Overie in Southwark[2] (it was the same official who localised Llangynwyd in Pembrokeshire). At the beginning of June they made an awful hash of a group of Suffolk applications, failing to write out the licences without falling into about half-a-dozen mistakes[3]; at the end of the same month they describe a Congregational batch of Hampshire licences as situated in *Wiltshire*.[4] There are examples,[5] like that of Thomas Barnes at Magor, of licences being entered twice over. At the end of p. 71 in the *Entry Book*, a licence for a *house* at Tamworth is entered; it is repeated at the opening of the following page, with the unfortunate result that a particular licence to the *minister* who lived in that house is not recorded at all. A Hampshire minister took care in more than one application to have himself described as a Presbyterian; but when his licence was at long last granted, behold, it put him down as a 'Congregational.'[6]

1 *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 517.
2 *S.P. 320*, 151; *O.R.*, iii, 336.
3 *S.P. 321*, 233; *E.B.*, p. 156; *O.R.*, ii, 917-918; iii, 451.
4 *ib.*, 269; *ib.*, p. 213; *O.R.*, iii, 510.
5 See *E.B.*, pp. 66, 70.
6 *S.P. 320*, 273, 274, 275, 276; *E.B.*, p. 191; p. 219 records his *house* as a place for Presbyterians.

The drollest mistake of all was made early on in the month of April : in an application sent in on behalf of an interesting character named Edward Veal to preach at a house in Wapping, the house was vaguely referred to as 'in Globe Alley—Knowne by all.'[1] Will it be believed that Benson entered the licence on p. 20 of the *Entry Book* as one to 'Edmund Veale to be a Pr. Teacher *in y^e^ howse known by all in Globe Alley in Wapping*,' thus making a mechanical copy of the words of the application ? There were in addition some minor inaccuracies in calling the licencee *Edmund* instead of *Edward*, and making the house 'known by all' a meeting-place for *Congregationals* instead of *Presbyterians*.[2] The prominent 'general' Baptist Thomas Collier of Somerset was granted a Presbyterian licence for one place on 25 July and a Congregational licence for another place *on the same day*[3]—a phenomenal triumph of clerkly comprehension (in more than one sense).

Passing in review these wonderful aberrations, it may be suggested to Congregational historians that they will pursue a much more profitable policy in finding Congregational teachers sheltering under the term 'Presbyterian' than in denying to Restoration Presbyterianism all measure of its pristine vigour. Even then they might find an occasional case like John Weaver's in which for some obscure reason (unless it was another of the clerk's mistakes) a Presbyterian masqueraded his real convictions under the name of 'Congregational.'

(v) A Process of Elimination.

On the most generous interpretation of the Indulgence documents, counting separately the licences granted to teacher and place, even giving full admission to the mysterious Daniel Williams of Wrexham, the Presbyterians of Wales could only claim 40 (out of a total of 185). Thus faint had been the impression upon the principality of the classical system. Indeed, not a single 'classis' was ever known to have been set up here ; for even the Presbyterians of English Flint did not form a unit of their own, but were annexed to that of Whitchurch in Salop.[4] If Presbyterian licences in

1 *S.P. 320*, 49.
2 In a separate entry on the same page.
3 Cp. *E.B.*, pp. 215 and 221.
4 Dr. W. A. Shaw : *Hist. Eng. Church*, ii, App. IIIb, 412-413.

England and Wales stood in the proportion of 13 : 21, in Wales alone they were just under 2 : 9.

And from these 40 six have to be at once and unhesitatingly subtracted. These were the licences that arrived at Beguildy in Radnor for three teachers and their respective houses, the teachers being old devoted followers of Vavasor Powell ; two of them, Morris and Richard Griffith, had in 1655 signed the *Word for God* against the Protectorate in close proximity to that of their leader,[1] while the third (Owen Morgan) is known as a Radnor itinerant during the Propagation.[2] Morris Griffith attended Vavasor on one of his anti-Cromwellian crusades into Cardiganshire, was an elder in his Radnor congregation about the same time, and an elder still in the same congregation of Dissenters in 1675.[3] To describe as Presbyterians[4] such intimate followers of Vavasor—whose whole career was in direct antithesis to modest and discreet Presbyterianism, who broke every axiom of Presbyterian polity, who at the Oxford church of All Hallows boldly denounced the University learning of Presbyterian dons to the intense chagrin of the Presbyterian Vice-Chancellor[5]—is a palpable misnomer, especially since so much collateral evidence is forthcoming that the whole three of them agreed with him so closely both in precept and practice. Their place is either among Independents or Baptists.

Two in Monmouth must be deleted as well—Reginald Morgan of Bettws by Newport, whose house is correctly described as ' Congregational,'[6] and James Lewis of Caldicot, whose house was licenced for Presbyterians on 15 June and corrected to ' Congregational ' on 10 August.[7] There is not the slightest evidence to connect either with Presbyterianism. And who but a clerk utterly oblivious of the life-history of Watkin Jones of Mynyddislwyn would enter his name as a Presbyterian as is done on p. 187 of the *Entry Book*—the disciple and spiritual legatee of Walter Cradock, during the Propagation an un-Presbyterian itinerant over three counties.[8]

1 p. 9 on British Museum copy (Thomason Tracts).
2 *H.P.M.*, p. 150.
3 *ib.*, p. 161 (n.1.), p. 195 (n. 12) ; *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 518.
4 By some strange mischance, the worthy compilers of *Hanes Eglwysi Annibynol Cymru* seem to have closed their eyes to the term ' *Presbyterian* ' in these Radnor entries (ii, 526-527).
5 *Life and Times of Anthony Wood* (ed. Clark), i, 221 (15 July, 1657).
6 *E.B.*, p. 231.
7 *ib.*, cp. pp. 187, 234.
8 *H.P.M.*, p. 149.

Needless to say, he is unequivocally described as an Independent by Maurice in 1675.[1] It was only to be expected that these Presbyterian licences of June were superseded by two new grants in August—for him and his house—in which he is properly described 'Congregational.'[2]

In *State Paper 321*, 364 (on the dorse of the memorandum), and in the company of 21 others, Mark Gibbon of Uzmaston in Pembroke and John Phillips of the same place are named as applying for house licences to receive Presbyterian ministers 'who have taken out Licenses for their persons already.' Neither Phillips nor Gibbon was a Presbyterian minister; more than that, not a single Presbyterian preacher was licenced nearer to them than Llangynwyd in Glamorgan. They must have been Congregational members of Peregrine Phillip's gathered church (he lived but a few miles away at Haverfordwest) who got mixed up with Presbyterians through the carelessness of a licence agent snowed under by Indulgence petitions—the junior James Innes.

Coming north to Montgomeryshire, it is not denied there were Presbyterians at Welshpool in 1657 (Philip Henry preached to them[3]), but it requires a very sanguine degree of credulity to accept Hugh Rogers as Presbyterian 'teacher' there in 1672, a man whose career as soldier and preacher had been so indecorously un-Presbyterian.[4] In fact, the 'Presb.' of 5 September becomes 'Congr.' on 18 November.[5] To Carnarvonshire came four Presbyterian licences (two ministers and their respective houses); but the present writer has never been able to bring Presbyterianism nearer home to Ellis Rowlands of Caernarvon than that he received six years before a parcel of books from the Presbyterian Philip Henry to be distributed,[6] nor to Ellis Williams of Llangybi than his absence (assuming he was alive) from the Llangybi conventicle of 1676, held at the house of Ellis Owen, and attended by the Independent gunmen of Lleyn and Eifionydd.

The sum of all these paragraphs is that the 40 alleged Presbyterian licences *drop down by 13*, leaving four other

1 *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 516.
2 *E.B.*, cp. pp. 187, 232.
3 *Diaries*, pp. 53-54 (20 July).
4 *H.P.M.*, 150, 259-260.
5 *E.B.*, cp. pp. 246, 270.
6 *Diaries*, p. 193 (Oct. 1666). It was a parcel of the Welsh translation of Baxter's *Call to the Unconverted*.

cases to be settled by more auspicious efforts of research.

(vi) Three Morgannwg Men.

In South Wales it is in Glamorgan alone that genuine Presbyterians show themselves. If the tradition preserved in the *Nonconformist Memorial* has a substantial basis of truth, then John French of Cardiff was a Presbyterian of that right wing which believed in keeping up a nodding acquaintance with the established order: 'he always attended the public worship of the church and preached in his own house afterwards.'[1] So did many Presbyterians who figure in the conventicle returns of 1669; so did some Presbyterians in the archdeaconry of Canterbury in 1676[2]; such was the attitude of that Presbyterian apologist after the Toleration Act already referred to, who declared the Church of England an 'excellent church,' that Presbyterians differed very little from her, and that they deeply resented not being accounted as her 'sons.'[3] Is not a Birmingham minister in 1672, whose licence proves him a Presbyterian, described on his application as of the 'Episcopall Perswasion,'[4] and was it not made a telling argument in favour of Edward Shearman of Nayland in Suffolk that he was episcopally ordained and willing to read the Common Prayer Book, he only having some scruples concerning 'Universall conformitie'?[5] Alexander Gordon cites the case of a Nottingham Presbyterian who persuaded his friends to make such use of their licenced liberty as might give least offence to their conforming brethen.[6] Similar to these, but not so aggressively pliant as some of them, French belonged to the class of conforming nonconformists.

If John French gravitated to the right, Samuel Jones kept to the left. Of his Presbyterianism there is no shadow of a doubt: he was ordained by presbyters as member of the Taunton classis in 1657, an important fact that had come to the ears of the Llandaff informers of 1669[7]; and the three

1 Vol. iii, 505.
2 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 168[b] (fourth 'observation' of Archdeacon Samuel Parker to Archbishop Sheldon, dated 13 April, 1676).
3 *The History of Non-Conformity As it was Argued . . . in 1661*, Preface, [1], [5].
4 *S.P., 320*, 260; cp. *E.B.*, p. 59.
5 *ib.*, 59.
6 *The Christian Life* (20 Jan., 1923), p. 19.
7 Cp. Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 721, with *Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 187[b].

arguments about the impropriety of re-ordination sent by him in 1665 to archdeacon Francis Davies prove by implication his continuing loyalty to the principles of 1657.[1] Equally evident with his loyalty to the Presbyterian faith is his fierce opposition to occasional conformity. To a nonconformist minister who 'did ordinarily go to church' (was it John French ?) and consulted Jones in 1680 about the expediency of going to the Lord's Table with his Anglican neighbours, the apostle of Llangynwyd waxed indignant against both compliances, called them slippery and inconstant practices, a desperate trampling upon former testimony, opportunists' tricks 'to save their stakes.' 'Are penal statutes,' he asks, 'such effectual means of satisfying conscience' ?[2]

Joshua Miller, licenced at Wenvoe, is also dubbed a Presbyterian. All that is known of him is Calamy's statement of his being at one time a bookseller in London,[3] and a tract in the National Library (with his name as author) fulminating against the Quakers of Cardiff.[4] Neither fact is sufficient to include him among Presbyterians. Nor is either or both sufficient to exclude him.

It is known that the mellowing effect of time brought great moderation of outlook to Marmaduke Matthews, the exile who came back to Swansea from New England. But the 'Presbyt.' which was entered on his first application for a licence was immediately changed to 'the people called Independents.' And it was as an Independent he was licenced.[5]

(vii) Philip Henry.

It would be a work of supererogation to prove Philip Henry a Presbyterian, or the four people in English Flint whose houses were licenced for that persuasion. His diaries never let us forget the fact. And Henry was a Presbyterian of such a type as gives a direct contradiction to the theory of Gordon and Turner that the tenets of classical Presbyterianism had been totally submerged by the penal code. For on the day after the Declaration was published in London he happened to enter on his diary what seemed to him the

1 Dr. Thos. Rees: *Hist. Prot. Noncon.*, p. 234.
2 *ib.*, pp. 236-238.
3 Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 731.
4 No. 1364 (*Civil War and Commonwealth Tracts*); description in Catalogue pp. 65-66.
5 *S.P. 320*, cp. 36, 37.

dangers implicit in a possible Indulgence: 'would not the allowing of separate places,' he wrote, 'help to overthrow our [Presbyterian] Parish order which God hath own'd'?[1] To him this premium on decentralisation, represented by the favour of the King and his officials, amounted to a negation of the rigid Presbyterian model and a triumph for the forces of Independency with its isolated congregations: 'we are put hereby in a Trilemma, either to turn flat Independents, or to strike in with the conformists, or to sit down in former silence and sufferings, till the Lord shall open a more efficient door.'[2] But a Presbyterian who recognises a danger is not thereby to be called an invertebrate classicist who has already succumbed to it. When his licences arrived, Henry inconsistently enough let his doubts and misgivings go with the wind. Far from sitting still, he utilised to the full the 'separate places' allowed, and granted to other householders provisional licences for which there was no corresponding entry at Whitehall.[3] He and the great majority of Presbyterian licencees were determined not to let Baptists and Independents run away with all the fruits of the Declaration.

More important still as directly controverting the theory that Presbyterianism had degenerated to be no more than a fashionable word for moderation, Henry six years later sat down solemnly to enter in his diary why he had so little love for Independency and Independents. By their practice of 'gathering' members for their congregations without regard to the bounds of parishes they plucked up the hedges of those presbyteries which Henry had seen formed in his younger days and devoutly hoped to see vigorous once more; by allowing unordained men to preach they made 'common' the ministry of God; worse than all, *they unchurched the nation*. The case against Congregationalism from the Presbyterian point of view was never more cogently put.[4]

The saint of Broad Oak, as a private person but not as minister, occasionally conformed to the liturgy of the Church of England in order that he might register at once his devotion to the principle of unity and his protest against the ecclesiastical anarchy which he saw inherent in Independent

1 *Diaries*, p. 250.
2 *ib.*
3 *Supra*, pp. 124-125.
4 *Diaries*, p. 277 (notes placed at the end of 1678).

individualism, with its emphasis on the priesthood of all believers. Regarding attendance at church it is worth noting that the practice of Philip Henry differed fundamentally from that of Samuel Jones, a fact which might add some piquancy to the talk of a 'few howres' they had when the latter visited the former in June 1682. Did they discuss Samuel's destructive letter penned in 1680, or did Henry fill up the time with an account of the debates he had had some months before with Bishop William Lloyd over conformity and re-ordination? The tone of the entry suggests that no controversial question was raised. Very sweet was the 'converse' and very worthy the visitor.[1]

(viii) Was Charles Edwards a Presbyterian?

Of the 236 *general* licences no less than 196 were for Presbyterians. This reminds us that Charles Edwards is included among the 196. No overt evidence of his predilections in church-government has come to light other than the word 'Presbyterian' opposite his name on p. 234 of the *Entry Book*. It is true a 'Mr. Edwards' preached at some date within 1655-1656 in the parish church of Wrexham[2]; and it has been held that only Presbyterians enjoyed that privilege.[3] Unfortunately for the second statement, the *Rawlinson MS.* records men *other* than Presbyterians (William Jones of Denbigh, for example, and Ambrose Mostyn) mounting the pulpit there; as for the first, 'Mr. Edwards' might well refer to Richard Edwards, Puritan vicar of Llanfair Dyffryn Clwyd and sometime Propagation 'approver.' It is not possible to go further than to say that the career and outlook of Charles Edwards would be more likely to make him a Presbyterian than either a Baptist or Independent.

1 *Diaries*, pp. 313-314 (5 June).
2 *Rawlinson MS.* C. 261 (obverso), f. 71v. Text = I Peter v, 12.
3 *Gweithiau Morgan Llwyd*, ii, Introdn. li.

XIX.

BAPTISTS IN DISGUISE.

(i) Bunyan's Attitude.

Though the principle of representation was nowhere more meticulously applied than in those 'general meetings' of the strict Baptists which were organised by John Miles during the interregnum,[1] not a single one of his followers preferred to be termed 'Presbyterian' in 1672-1673. And not a single one of them was so called by either agent or clerk. Over the Border, especially among the 'open' Baptists, that distinction does not hold. John Tombes, the great immersionist who had once challenged Baxter to debate at Bewdley and had taken the ring against the pædo-Baptists at Abergavenny 19 years before 1672, had his house at Salisbury licenced for Presbyterians[2]; so had Thomas Hardcastle, recommended by Vavasor Powell to be second pastor of the church of Broadmead in Bristol[3]; in a similar category was Andrew Gifford of the same town, with the difference that in his actual licence, now preserved at the Bristol Baptist College, the word Presbyterian has been erased and 'Baptist' written above it.[4] Indeed, between the publication of his second 'summary' volume of the *Original Records* in 1911 and his explanatory third volume in 1914, Professor Lyon Turner received a budget of corrections from the Baptist expert Dr. Whitley, in which the latter supplied the names of over 30 Baptists in England sheltering under the terms Presbyterian or Congregational in the licence-entries. This information formed a special Appendix to Volume III.[5]

John Bunyan's licence to preach at the house of Josias Roughead in Bedford and the 56 other licences applied for

1 *H.P.M.*, pp. 202-208.
2 *E.B.*, p. 39. His own personal licence is *not* on record, although the junior Innes says he (Innes) received it at Whitehall on 20 April (*S.P. 320*, 166).
3 *ib.*, p. 248; see also *Broadmead Recs.*, ed. Haycroft, pp. 68-69.
4 *ib.*, p. 249: cp. *Bapt. Hist. Soc. Trans.*, i, 168, 176.
5 App. III, pp. 837-842.

on *St. Pap. 321*, 58, pass by without any protest from Dr. Whitley, ostensibly for the good reason that that famous Baptist and his immediate followers deliberately described themselves as 'Congregational'—at the head of the application stands 'all Congregationall,' words written (according to some) in Bunyan's own hand.[1] 'John Bunyan thought that a difference of view on the mode of administration of Christian Baptism, or the epoch in the Christian course at which it should be administered, or even on the exact significance to be attached to the rite itself, should not be made a dividing line between the great anti-prelatical or non-Episcopalian bodies of Protestant Nonconformists.'[2] In other words, Bunyan laid a greater premium on distinctions of church-government than on his own admitted convictions on the exact observance of one of the church's great ordinances. Was he not to forget to dip his Pilgrim, did he not refuse to transfer a sister of his own congregation at Bedford to a strict Anabaptist church in London (though quite ready to transfer another to an 'open' communion church), and was it not held until very recently that he had even allowed three of his children to be baptised in the parish church, one in this year 1672? It is possible to go further and say that a good deal of Bunyan's energies in 1672-1674 was spent in composing three books to combat the views of the advanced Anabaptists.[3]

There is no reasonable ground for cavilling at the long sentence of Prof. Lyon Turner's quoted above, nor at the same sentiment found embedded in two widely-separated pages in his third volume.[4] Bunyan was a Baptist, but a *free* or *open* Baptist who, according to the title of a book published by him in 1673, held that 'differences in judgment about water baptism [were] no bar to communion.' *In the licence-documents it will be found that such Baptists almost invariably preferred to pass as Congregationals.* In these cases the surviving applications of the licence agents are so explicit and the licence entries seem so deliberately

1 Dr. John Brown's *Life*, tercentenary edn. (Mott Harrison), pp. 215-217. For another view, see *O.R.*, iii, 405-406.
2 *O.R.*, i, Preface, xvii, n.*.
3 Dr. John Brown: *Life o Bunyan*, pp. 235-241, 249; *O.R.*, iii, 406, n.†
4 pp. 406-407, 731

uniform that the London clerks can be freely acquitted of any idiosyncracy.

(ii) **The Llantrisant School.**

Such Baptists flourished in Wales in the counties of Radnor and Montgomery as disciples of Vavasor Powell, and in the central hundreds of Monmouth as followers of the dead leader William Thomas of Llantrisant. There is the strongest probability that if these two leaders were alive in 1672 and were to accept the Indulgence, *they would range themselves under the Congregational banner and not under the Baptist.* Of Powell it will suffice to say that his actual baptism by immersion only took place late in 1655, and that from this date till his death in 1670 he laid but comparatively little insistence upon this fundamental tenet of the whole-hearted Baptists. Has it been forgotten how the ultra-strict Baptists of Rhydwilym dropped out unceremoniously that article in his Confession of Faith which gave an open welcome to all good men to the Lord's Table ?[1] Those wide-awake sectaries knew something of the philosophy of religion—they would not give away their independence by accepting into their creed a number of attractive but treacherous articles of faith.

It used to be thought that William Thomas reared a colony of Baptists at Llanfaches contemporaneous with the latter days of Wroth ; but Champlin Burrage's masterly analysis of the *Broadmead Records*, especially his collating of the Underhill edition of 1847 with the Haycroft edition of 1865, has given a serious set-back to that theory.[2] At whatever point in time William Thomas gathered around him a knot of Baptists, it is certain that the fierce Edward Dafydd of Margam (who composed his *Cerdd y Ffanaticiaid* some time during the Commonwealth) refers to him as having taken deep root in Monmouth, 'the self-ordained pig, wallower in water.'[3] Under the benevolent hegemony of Cradock these open Baptists flourished apace, cooped up the stricter Baptists in the northern angle of the county, and even boasted some converts from that watertight system which Miles had put together so closely. The storms of the Restoration drove

1 *Supra*, p. 38.
2 *Trans. Bapt. Hist. Soc.*, iii, 212-214, 217.
3 *Seren Gomer*, July 1902, p. 170 (Mr. Shankland's transcript).

the people of William Thomas, sound Baptists though they were on the particular observance of adult immersion, to take shelter in the houses of Independents and Baptists indiscriminately, with the result that the Llandaff spies of 1669 are so hard put to it to fill up the 'sect' column with any degree of accuracy that they leave it vacant for every conventicle William Thomas was wont to preach at.[1]

This close affinity of the Monmouth free Baptists with Independents—an affinity much older than the days of distress—must not obscure the undoubted fact *that they were Baptists, and not Independents.* To this conclusion there exists irrefragable testimony in two sources: the visits, three in number, paid by William Thomas in 1667 to the 'open' church of Broadmead Baptists at Bristol, visits either to give advice in the election of elders or to immerse new members at Baptist Mill[2]; and the definite words of Henry Maurice in 1675, four years after the death of William Thomas, that the latter's congregation kept 'numerically distinct' from the Independents, 'but are in judgment for free communion with saints as saints.'[3] It follows that if any teachers of these people are licenced 'Congregational' in 1672, elementary justice to the Baptist cause calls loudly for their reinstatement.

All but two of the licenced free Baptists of Wales fall into this 'Congregational' category. Those two are Christopher Price, the apothecary of Abergavenny, and John Edwards, a shoemaker from the same town. Both were busy holding up the arms of Tombes in the Abergavenny debate of 1653. Both signed the *Humble Address* to Cromwell in 1656 with their names next to each other on p. 13, and sixteen years later they were granted licences to preach on the same day of August 10—two men who, if they were aware of Bunyan's lead in May, did not follow it; two Baptist stalwarts, albeit for free communion, who did not fall into line with the other members of the Llantrisant group that had received 'Congr.' licences on July 22 and July 25. To account for this attitude, one can only suggest that wherever the trail of Miles ran—Abergavenny had been his

1 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 188[b].
2 *Broadmead Recs.* (1865 ed.), pp. 60, 61, 63.
3 *ib.* (1847 ed.), pp. 515-516.

eastern headquarters—it left behind it an unmistakable odour of astringency. Free Baptists felt free to call themselves *Baptists* where *he* had been.

This and the following paragraphs have to take in hand the dangerous duty of transforming Independents into Baptists, and of finding reinforcements for the two worthies of Abergavenny. Proofs of their Baptist faith will be summoned from authentic records before and after the Indulgence—from the conventicle returns of 1669, from the letter sent by Maurice to Bristol in 1675, from the report sent to the London Baptist authorities in 1690 concerning the officers and outlook of Baptist congregations in Wales[1] (sent, be it noted, by Dr. Christopher Price of Abergavenny). The licence entry in *E.B. 38A* forgot to state the particular sect William Milman of Llangwm belonged to, and forgot also to specify the persuasion of the householder William Richards at whose house he was allowed to preach[2]; but 'Congr.' would rest very naturally on the shoulders of a man who had consorted so closely with William Thomas at the Llangwm conventicle in 1669 and with such pronounced Independents as Henry Walter and Thomas Barnes in the conventicles of Netherwent.[3] That he was a Baptist and a Sabbatarian is vouched for by the Llandaff informers; that he remained in the same faith is proved both by Henry Maurice and the report of 1690. This latter document testifies the same of Walter Williams of Llangibby, licenced there in 1672 as 'Congr.' to preach at the house of Edward Waters.

The pastor of the Llangwm-Llantrisant free Baptists after the death of William Thomas was Thomas Quarrell, once usher of the Puritan free school at the town of Montgomery.[4] In him the open Baptists of North and South seem to converge. Relative (most probably) of Vavasor's first wife,[5] relative also of the James Quarrell who defended Powell in the *Examen* and was licenced at Shrewsbury in 1672, Thomas before 1669 had migrated south to live at Whitchurch in Glamorgan. In that year he was busy preaching in secret conventicles on

1 Joshua Thomas: *Hanes*, pp. 245-246.
2 cp. pp. 204, 220.
3 *Lambeth MS. 639*, ff. 186[b], 188[b].
4 *H.P.M.*, p. 227.
5 She is described by Dr. John Walker (following Alexander Griffith) as 'Sweet and Dear Mrs. Quarrel, sometimes a Walking Pedlar, and Seller of Hot-Waters, in Presteign in Radnorshire' (*Suffs.*, i, 148, col. 1).

the Glamorgan-Monmouth border ; shortly before his death in 1670 Vavasor sent him (with two others) one of his last communications[1] ; before 1672 he had moved east to Shirenewton, since it was at the house of John Maurice in that parish he was given indulgence to preach. He was alive in 1690 to find a place in Dr. Price's report side by side with his coadjutors Milman and Walter Williams. Equally good evidence that these were pronounced Baptists is the absence of all three from the Presbytero-Independent lists of Monmouth ministers that appears in the *Gordon MS.* of 1690-1692. All but this latter source was open to Dr. Thomas Rees when he revised his work in 1883, yet he was so inveterate an Independent that he would not openly admit Quarrell a Baptist[2] ; on the other hand, the editor of the 1885 edition of Joshua Thomas' *Hanes*, the Rev. Benjamin Davies of Pontypridd, was so inveterate a ' close ' Baptist that he must force Quarrell into the ranks of the close communionists.[3] He bases his argument on the fact that Quarrell's congregation was represented in the Baptist Assembly held in London in 1689, and that only strict Baptists were represented there. It is one of the contributions of Spinther James to Baptist history to prove the inaccuracy of such a contention.[4] Like his predecessor William Thomas, Quarrell was an ' open ' Baptist. On p. 209 of the *Entry Book* he is a ' Congregational.'

Eglwysilan saw the remarkable phenomenon of a prominent henchman of Miles leaving the ranks of the strict communionists : otherwise, how is one to explain the word ' Congr.' in the licence granted to Thomas John (or Jones) of that place on August 10 ? Once he had been one of the chief leaders of the Ilstonian church which met at Llantrisant in Glamorgan, and in 1654 was even sent to carry the Ilstonian gospel to one of the Monmouth strongholds of William Thomas himself.[5] Thomas Jones was to preach in 1672 at the house of William Jones (' John ' in the record), a man who appears in the chronicles of Joshua Thomas as living at Craigyrallt and a great sufferer under the penal code.[6] Notwithstanding this apparent apostacy, Thomas Jones is nothing but a

1 Spinther James : *Hanes y Bed.*, ii, 399 : D. Davies : *Vavasor Powell*, p. 129.
2 *Hist. Prot. Noncon.*, p. 146.
3 pp. 249-250, n. †.
4 *Hanes*, iii, 8-10.
5 Joshua Thomas : *Hanes*, p. 169 ; Spinther James, ii, 307.
6 *ib.*, pp. 175-176.

Baptist to Henry Maurice in 1675 (he is described as 'of Gelligaer,' and as having died a short while before)[1]; the householder William Jones lived until 1690 to sign a letter from the Baptists of those parts to the London Assembly of that year.[2] About twenty years after that one of the many Anglican correspondents of Dr. John Walker indulged in a violent diatribe against the traditionally tumultuous Puritanism of the Glamorgan border, specifically referring to this William Jones as one of the fierce Anabaptists of the previous generation.[3] In face of these records, how came Thomas Jones to be described as 'Congr.' in 1672? Light comes from two sources: a word in Henry Maurice's letter, and a story preserved by Joshua Thomas. According to the former, Jones was a 'moderate' man, a term used by a zealous Independent to denote Baptists not too narrowly exclusive in their dogma; according to the latter, Thomas Jones had allowed an old Baptist of Blaenau Gwent, Simon Lewis by name, to take communion in two kinds in two places, at one place with Independents, at the other with Baptists.[4] Thus did Thomas Jones become a disciple of John Bunyan instead of John Miles, and leave the stringent atmosphere of one Llantrisant for the more accommodating climate of another. As he moved east he relaxed his principles. Still a Baptist, for all that.

(iii) The Penyrwrlodd Family.

Moving upwards to Brecknock, we alight at Llanigon, where at Penyrwrlodd lived Captain William Watkins, whose house was licenced as a 'place' for the Congregational persuasion on 30 September. A more interesting character did not live in Wales at that time. Valorous captain in the Parliamentary army, clerk to the Propagation Commissioners for Brecon and Radnor from 1650 to 1653, a special object of attack by Alexander Griffith, defendant in Exchequer indemnity cases after the Restoration—he lived until 1687 to be named in January as one of the trustees of the Boughrood Charity,[5]

1 *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 515.
2 Joshua Thomas: *Hanes*, p. 177.
3 *MS. J. Walker*, c. 4, ff. 65-65b.
4 *Hanes*, p. 179. It is just possible also to find the householder William Jones under the name of William John [Thomas] opening his house in 1669 to the ministrations of John Powell, an avowed Independent, and Thomas Quarrell of Whitchurch, the coming leader of the Monmouth free communionists (*Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 187-'Egloisilan').
5 Edwin Poole: *Hist. Breck. Charities* (1880), pp. 4-6.

and in December to be referred to as a 'dissenter' in the answers sent up by the Duke of Beaufort to James II.[1] The historian of the county supplies the picturesque detail that the Captain built the old part of the mansion in 1651, and left there at his death a vast number of coats-of-mail.[2] The *Lay Subsidy Rolls* inform us that he was chargeable for hearth tax on the basis of eight grates.[3]

His wife, Alicia by name and hailing from Monmouthshire,[4] was no less interesting. It is to her that Vavasor Powell refers as one who had kept to her house for four years, to her bed for two years, but who by his prayerful intercession one night was able to walk three or four miles to hear him preach on the morrow[5]; it is to her also that Henry Maurice alludes in his diary for 1672 as one possessing 'a sweet gracious spirit'[6]; it is of her, most probably, a story was brought to the ears of Joshua Thomas (about 1743) that a servant of hers used occasionally to travel on the Sabbath as far as Llanwenarth in Monmouth, taking with him a pocketful of coins to be distributed amongst the sufferers of persecution.[7] Information is lacking as to whether this servant or his mistress was a member at Llanwenarth.

The double force of the visit of Vavasor and the welcome given to Maurice leads to the conviction that the Penyrwrlodd family were Independents who had serious affinities with the 'free' Baptists. More at present it would not be safe to predicate. Too powerful an emphasis on the Llanwenarth story heard by Joshua Thomas would declare the captain's wife to be a 'close' Baptist, and not 'open' at all. And should Spinther's belief in a close relation between the captain himself and Thomas Watkins of Olchon[8]—one of the most rigid Baptists of his time and one of the two crusaders who helped founding the Rhydwilym cause in 1668—be substantiated, then William Watkins must be presumed to have

1 *Rawlinson MS.* A. 139[8], f. 155.
2 Theophilus Jones: *Hist. Breck*, ii, 402.
3 219/63 (temp. Charles II).
4 She was the 'Alse, dau. of James Prichard, gent., de Campston,' christened on 4 Nov., 1627, at the parish church of Grosmont (Sir Joseph Bradney: *Parish Register*, p. 46 and n. 2).
5 *Life* (1671), p. 18.
6 Dr. Thos. Rees: *Hist. Prot. Noncon.*, p. 212.
7 *Hanes*, p. 153, and n. †.
8 *Hanes y Bedyddwyr*, ii, 290. It behoves us to say that one of the church-wardens of Llanigon in 1670 was a *William Watkins* who also has his name inscribed on the bells of that church (Mrs. Finch Dawson: *The Churches of Brecknock*, p. 142). Surely he was not the sometime Parliamentary captain and harbourer of Puritan hearers in 1672-1673!

abjured both infant baptisers and the Bunyan school. In that case he would also lose his place in this chapter.

(iv) 'Baptists for the Most Part.'

Llanigon might almost be said to be the southward terminus of that wide region over which Vavasor Powell exercised a dictatorship, political as well as religious, in the spacious days of freedom. Vavasor, Baptist and free communionist. It is not to be expected, always keeping in mind the Bunyanite practice, that any of his licenced disciples in Radnor and Montgomery would *call* themselves Baptists; but that is no reason for taking the State Paper at its face value and include them all among the Independents. 'These are baptists in judgment for the most part, yet many of them otherwise,' says Henry Maurice in 1675 in his report on the Dissenters of county Montgomery[1]; in a slightly lower key is his summary for Radnor, 'partly of Independents, partly of Baptists.'[2]

Is it likely that, of the round dozen licences that came to these two counties and were labelled 'Congregational,' not one sheltered a free Baptist under that label? If the mantle of Vavasor as pastor of this wide congregation (covering two whole counties) fell naturally upon the shoulders of Henry Williams of Ysgafell, and he an undoubted Baptist, does it not tend to show that that element was predominant? If the *Exchequer Depositions* have lately yielded up the fact that Richard Powell of Glasbury, and he not usually associated with any branch of Baptists, refused to baptise children as Puritan minister of that parish and said that such a mode of baptism was not warranted by the law of God,[3] is it not more than possible that several of the licenced Congregationals (so-called) were prone to a similar practice?

On account of the paucity of evidence concerning the individual licences, proof has to wait. But Congregational historians may rest assured that when the necessary light will come the 'Congr.' totals of Professor Lyon Turner will suffer not a little diminution. That is the reason behind

1 *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 517.
2 *ib.*, p. 518.
3 Mixed Cos. (Breck. & Rad.), No. 8, Hilary, 15-16 Chas. II. The deponents were two Anglican clergymen, but there is no reason to doubt their evidence on the matter of fact.

the statement in the last chapter that the six Beguildy licences taken from the Presbyterians would fall to be counted either as Congregational *or Baptist.*[1]

(v) Thomas Tonman.

This Dissenter, hailing from Llanfihangel Nant Melan in Radnor, had his house licenced on 18 November, but the clerk forgot to state what sect was to assemble there. All that can be said is that the entry just preceding his records a licence for a London Presbyterian, the one immediately following him for a Baptist of Devizes.[2] Notwithstanding this unnecessary silence of the clerk, Tonman had a religious history quite unique of its kind—signatory of the Vavasorian *Word for God* in 1655,[3] described thirty-two years later as a ' dissenter not in [the] commission [of peace].'[4] This second entry proclaims him the possessor of some property in the county. Was he the ' Tom Tudman ' at whose house in New Radnor Vavasor had a meeting at the end of February 1653-1654 during the heat of his anti-Cromwellian propaganda ? Even though the ' Tudman ' of the informer's report is corrected to the ' Tunman ' found in an intercepted letter in the *Thurloe Papers* and written by the hand of the great Vavasor himself, and even assuming that the *Tunman* of 1654 is the same man as the *Tonman* of 1672, his precise sectarian convictions in the latter year are still left indeterminate.[5]

However, it can be said that in Dr. Evans' *Lists* of 1715, Nant Melan, Glasgwm and New Radnor are grouped together as forming one Baptist congregation 400 in number,[6] and that Joshua Thomas refers to two Tonmans (with others) joining in 1725 to pay £33 for the lease of a Baptist meeting-place in New Radnor.[7] We thus find that Nant Melan had strong Baptist associations and that the Tonman family were prominent among the supporters of the Baptist cause. There is, therefore, considerable presumptive evidence that the Thomas Tonman of 1672 was a Vavasorian Baptist who, no doubt, found ' Congr.' written on the licence that came to

1 *Supra*, p. 189.
2 *E.B.*, p. 273.
3 p. 9 (B.M. copy).
4 *Rawlinson MS.* A. 139[a], f. 175—' Tenman.'
5 For these references, see *Thurloe St. Pap.*, ii, 118, 128.
6 Dr. Thos. Rees : *Hist. Prot. Noncon.*, p. 265.
7 *Hanes*, p. 315.

Llanfihangel. The clerk could not very well leave that a blank.

(vi) Captain Jenkin Jones.

In Brecknock the disappearance of Jenkin Jones from Llanthetty was one of the dramatic episodes of the Restoration. Few characters in Puritan Wales surpassed in forceful influence this son of Tymawr. Captain, Propagation 'approver,' opponent of the Protectorate, minister of his native parish, vigorous delayer of the Royalist purposes—it is no surprise he was accompanied to Carmarthen prison by a mob flinging stones[1]; no surprise too that when he came out, after a month's incarceration, he was soon gathering around him a retinue of 500 or 600 men, and swearing he would be even with the new government before Michaelmas.[2] He was captured again and placed in prison more securely.

Through all these vicissitudes Jenkin was a Baptist. In 1658 a Brecon man felt called upon to sound an 'alarum to corporations' to warn the world of the pernicious colony of Anabaptists, no better than those of Munster, which was growing up in south Brecknock.[3] According to Joshua Thomas, he carried his missionary zeal with him to prison, and there converted to the Baptist faith William Jones, who was soon to become the virtual head of the Rhydwilym congregation.[4] Some time before 1672 the Brecknock ex-captain took up his quarters at Cilgerran in Pembroke.[5] That a Baptist had arrived in that neighbourhood probably explains the baptism of the two Cilfowyr women (the *Rhydwilym Register* describes them as 'precedently baptized') who had to undergo imposition of hands before being fully admitted to the very strict society of William Jones.[6] Converter and converted differed as to the bounds of communion. For Jenkin Jones had never ceased preaching and practising 'open' principles from the days he looked askance at the advance of Miles up the Wye Valley[7] to the

1 *The Lord's Loud Call to England* (1660), p. 13 –letter to Henry Jessey from Thomas Gwyn, dated 29 June (Thomason Colln., E. 1038.8).
2 *C.S.P.*, 1660-1661, pp. 124, 127.
3 No. 210, *Commonwealth Tracts*, N.L.W. (pp. 2-8).
4 *Hanes*, p. 319 (not as a fact, but as extremely likely).
5 A *Jenkin Jones* was assessed at three hearths in 'Kilgarron Town and parrish' on 10 January, 22 Charles II, *i.e.*, 1670-1671 (*Lay Subsidy Rolls*, 24/532, Pembroke).
6 They were both admitted on 12 July, 1668.
7 Joshua Thomas: *Hanes*, p. 138.

days of 1675 when his house at Cilgerran gave open welcome to the Independents of the lower Teify reaches.[1] In face of these facts, it is the most natural thing in the world to find his licence marked 'Congregational.'

At this point a word of caution is necessary. Though items of evidence have been examined, notably the Carmarthen imprisonment and the baptising of the Cilfowyr women, which build up plausible milestones on the way from Llanthetty to Cilgerran, it has also to be borne in mind that there was a Jenkin Jones associated with Pembrokeshire years before the Restoration—a Jenkin Jones who was subscribing the *Humble Address* to Cromwell in 1656[2] at a time when the Brecknock Jenkin Jones was busy seconding Vavasor Powell in opposition to the Protectorate. Which of the two appeared in a list of Pembrokeshire J.P.'s issued at the beginning of 1688 as one of the Dissenters placed upon the bench in pursuance of James II.'s quasi-tolerant policy[3]? Henry Maurice refers to the Jones who harboured Independents in 1675 as 'Captain,' and such is the title always given in the chronicles of the interregnum to the soldier-preacher of Llanthetty. It does not look very probable that Pembrokeshire would boast two Jenkin Joneses at one and the same time and both of them old Parliamentary captains. The balance of the argument is in favour of the migration. At the last moment comes an entry on the *Lay Subsidy Rolls* that in 1661 a Jenkin Jones was paying 3/4 hearth tax for 'ten graets'—in the parish of St. David's in the hundred of Dewsland.[4] This must be the *other* Jenkin Jones, the signatory of the *Address* of 1656, and (in all probability) the Jones of that name who had enough property to be a J.P. in 1688. A close examination of that *Address* shows his name surrounded on both sides by men from south-western Pembroke. In other words, he did *not* live in the district of Cilgerran.

(vii) Congregational v. Independent.

This question of the Bunyanites of 1672 in Wales should not be closed without some reference to another curious phenomenon—they are each and all described as 'Congregational' rather than

1 *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 517.
2 p. 9 (Thomason Tract, B.M.).
3 *Rawlinson MS.* A. 139[1], f. 140—'Jenkyn Jones.'
4 265/18, Pembroke, 22 Nov., 13 Charles II.

'Independent.' Readers of Dr. R. W. Dale's *History of English Congregationalism* are well acquainted with his distinction between the two terms,[1] and a later writer who possesses considerable knowledge of the religious history of the Restoration has given his opinion that the *Independents* were those intransigent Puritans who had not surrendered the hope of seeing another Cromwell, while the *Congregationalists* were content with a term to divide themselves off from the Presbyterians.[2] At one time the present writer was so impressed with this distinction that he made an analysis of the licence-entries and found that the 'Congrs.' of Wales outnumbered the 'Indts.' by 2 to 1 (from this angle of view Monmouth and Carnarvon were the Independent strongholds, Denbigh and Cardigan the Congregational). But when he noticed that the moderate Matthews was licenced in Swansea as an Indt. and the extremer Higgs as a Congregational, that the *S. P. 320* could within 24 hours transform the same Matthews from a Presbyterian into an Independent,[3] and that Thomas Barnes of Magor is an Indt. on one page of the *E. B.* and a Congr. on another,[4] it was found impossible to keep up a sensible and scientific distinction any longer. In the licence papers the terms are used quite haphazardly. Was it accident or caution that made the audience of a John Hartley of Kildwick in Craven to include "Indt. & Congr.'[5] ?

(viii) Summary.

Four Baptists have been found deliberately hiding under the term 'Congregational.' The Llanthetty-Cilgerran nexus is so near completion that Jenkin Jones can be confidently added as a fifth. Tonman of Llanfihangel is saved from this charge by the dereliction of a clerk. Evidence is gathering which may drive Watkins of Llanigon into the arms of the strict Baptists. Certain it is that reinforced research will bring new accessions to the 'free' Baptist ranks from the disguised Vavasorians of Radnor and Montgomery. And not a little justification for the chapter can be found in the way Professor Lyon Turner has coolly appropriated all these Baptists as Independents (both in the summaries of Vol. II and the

1 pp. 375–376.
2 Rev. John Stanley: *Lest We Forget*, p. 101.
3 cp. 36, 37.
4 cp. *E.B.*, pp. 234, 237.
5 *E.B.*, p. 34 (licenced 20 Apr., 1672).

tables of Vol. III), and in that prudent modesty which made Dr. W. T. Whitley leave his fellow-Baptists west of the Severn and Wye to work out their own salvation.

NOTE: BARZILLAI JONES, DEAN OF LISMORE.

Discoveries have lately been made which add new interest to the story of Captain Jenkin Jones of Llanthetty. Theophilus Jones had long ago told us of the Captain's marriage to a daughter of one of the Mansells (*Hist. Breck.*, 1898 ed., 429). An *Add. MS.* at the N.L.W. gives her name as Barbara, tells us she was his second wife, daughter to Sir Anthony Mansell of Briton Ferry, sister and co-heiress to Sir Edward Mansell of Muddlescombe in Carmarthenshire, and therefore half-sister to Bussy Mansell the Glamorgan Parliamentary leader. The particulars supplied in a Chancery suit of 1742 place these facts beyond dispute. These details, let us hasten to add, are not the most piquant revelations of the suit in Chancery. They tell of issue to Jenkin and Barbara, of a son named Barzillai, who after a satisfactory career at Oxford in his father's old college of Jesus ultimately became Dean of Lismore in Ireland and Chancellor of Waterford Cathedral (cp. *Foster's Alumni*, i, 818). How exactly the son of the dour Puritan preacher found himself subscribing Anglican declarations at Jesus and was enabled to advance quite rapidly in the Irish hierarchy, is at present obscure—most probably it was the dominance of the Mansell interest in the Llanthetty household because of the enforced exile of its head at the Restoration. The old story sent him to seek exile in England, but it is equally natural, to say the least, to see him moving west to Cilgerran, where the Carmarthenshire Mansells may have interests in land and influential connections. In any case, the admirers of Jenkin Jones and those who cherish the belief that it was he who held the Cilgerran licence in 1672-1675 will have to keep vividly in mind that his son Barzillai was fast climbing the Anglican ladder at Oxford just when the father was making full use of an anti-Anglican Indulgence to preach Baptist doctrines on the southern banks of the Teify. Possibly they will say that, though Barzillai forsook the faith of his father yet was he a Barzillai indeed, a chip of the old stubborn block of Tymawr—did he not live to be attainted by James II and even to refuse to swear the oaths to William and Mary ? *Un*fortunately they will also have to explain how at some juncture in his life he fell into a debt of £3,000 to the great vexation of his mother Barbara, who had to enter into burdensome indentures in order to get the debt paid. I am not sure whether he is the Barzillai Jones whose daughter Elizabeth was baptised at Cardiff in 1675 (*Cardiff City Records*, iii, 423), though it is practically certain he was living at that town in 1699—presumably he had retired there after nonjuring away his Irish promotions and emoluments—when one of his sons, another Barzillai, matriculated at Jesus College, Oxford (*Alumni Oxon.*, i, 818). In conclusion, it must be said that the main interest of this Note is due to Sir Joseph Bradney, who not only called my attention to the Chancery suit of 1742, but readily supplied me with all the particulars of it.

XX.

THE ARMINIAN DÉBÂCLE.

i) An Isolated Group.

This obsession with men of Calvin's school—theologically all Presbyterians were his direct disciples, practically all Independents, and all Baptists, whether 'open' or 'close'—has relegated to obscurity the Arminian Baptists who lived in the Radnor and Brecknock highlands. He would be indeed a bold man who could point with confidence to the exact beginnings of these somewhat peculiar people on the Welsh border. According to a very rare pamphlet unearthed by Mr. Shankland, Thomas Lamb of Bel Alley in London is described by an opponent as a chandler clad in a grey suit preaching in private houses, and rebaptising at a frosty time in the night season those 'who could answer for themselves'—this as early as 1639[1] in the river Severn by Gloucester. Lamb is well known as Anabaptist and Arminian. It is about seven years later than this, through the visit of a man even more famous than Lamb, that is credited by definite evidence—evidence attested by two Radnorshire men and by the Independent Maurice—with being the time when the principles of the General Baptists were planted west of the Dyke. That missionary was Jeremiah Ives, the vivacious pastor of the Baptist congregation at the Old Jewry, immediately induced to come west by the importunities of Hugh Evans of Llanhir. This Hugh Evans, we are told, was a man zealous in the Gospel, his love kindled towards God and man, much moved by love for the truth and for his native country, whose daily calling had taken him to an England where doctrines old and new were given every opportunity to flourish unrestrained. He returned to

1 *Seren Gomer*, March 1902, pp. 101-102. He is quoting from *Wynell's Covenant Plea for Infants*, published at Oxford in 1642.

Wales in company with Ives. The London preacher 'lived for some time amongst these people.'[1]

Ives very surely was one of the most ubiquitous preachers of his time, with interests wide as life, a daring and able controversialist. Even Hugh Evans had lived for some time in Worcester, afterwards at Coventry, and paid at least one visit to the capital. Between them, it may be pretty safely conjectured, was drafted that Arminian confession of faith which figures among the *Harleian MSS.*, a document emphasising the dogma of free grace and the possibility of universal salvation.[2] Forceful preachers, an attractive gospel, a short compact confession drawn up *ad hoc*—these Baptists began life with many factors in their favour. But almost as soon as Ives had recrossed the Border to join his English friends, these General Baptists became most particular, and developed into a small self-contained community without progress or propaganda. They let themselves drift away from their English connections: for though a confession of faith was compiled by their fellow-Baptists in the Midlands in 1651, a confession that was specifically said to apply to them in Wales, neither Hugh Evans nor any lesser leader put in an appearance as delegates.[3] On the other hand, it may be mentioned that a 'Mr. Lambe' in 1651-1652 was in receipt of £40 7s. 0d. as Propagation lecturer in the town of Brecon,[4] who might (it is a remote possibility) have been the Thomas Lamb who was baptising adults in the Severn in 1639. With the exception that some of their members did become schoolmasters and itinerants from 1650 to 1653, they do not seem to have had eyes nor ears for religious developments in their own land. Not one of them sought the approval of the Triers; the *Lambeth Books* are totally silent about them. When the inception of the Protectorate divided Puritan Wales into two unequal bands, and horsemen rode breathlessly across country to secure support either for Vavasor's *Word for God* or for Cradock's *Humble Address*, these Arminians never gave a sign.[5] Not one of them can

1 John Price: *The Sun Outshining the Moon* (1658), p. 9; *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 518.

2 No. 6898, ff. 219-232.

3 *Religious Developments in Wales* (1923), p. 259 (and n. 1).

4 *MS. J. Walker*, c. 13, f. 63.

5 A *Hugh Evans* subscribed the *Word* (p. 10). That name occurs flanked on one side by a Montgomeryshire man, on the other by a Merioneth signatory. No doubt he was the Merioneth man of that name who figures in the biography of Morgan Llwyd (J. H. Davies: *Gweithiau*, ii, Intrcdn., lxxix).

be seen among the signatories of either. Their religious life was as exclusive as that of the early monastic orders.

(ii) **Friends.**

We must not exaggerate. Were all their energies required to combat the Quakers? Most unfortunately for them, there was a nebulous borderland where the Quaker's light and the Arminian's grace seemed to run one into the other: in an age of rash imaginings, in a land of undeveloped theology, it was easy for the two to be confused. Confused with a vengeance they were. It was the aim of these Friends to make the Arminian's conversion as easy and effective as possible. They made great play with verbal inexactitudes of doctrine and with accidental similarities in polity.[1] Holmes passed through Radnorshire on his first visit to the South; in the same county George Fox had some of his most successful meetings. The Arminian congregations were 'broken in peeses.'[2] It was from this Welsh home of the General Baptists that some of the most pugnacious Quakers of the age came forth, notably the Morgan Watkin who stood up in debate against Vavasor Powell at Knighton and the Peter Price who proudly declared in 1681 he had paid no tithes for forty years.[3]

For a time the Arminians made a stubborn stand against their presumptuous opponents. Did a John Moon cast disparaging remarks about Hugh Evans (who had died in 1656), there came a *Sun* to outshine the moon[4]: he was simply overwhelmed by the virulence and vituperation of two of the dead man's followers; did Alexander Parker, one of the English Friends travelling through Radnor, enter into a debate with an Arminian at a farmhouse outside Rhayader, he also was positively startled by the hot reception he got.[5] But these Baptists were too fond of acting on the defensive. And what with the boldness of new apostates, what with the wonderful powers of organisation the Quakers quickly developed, what with the secular chicanery which made Friends test to the full the laws and lawyers of the Restoration, the poor isolated Arminians soon found the land giving way

1 For a fuller treatment of this assimilation-field, see *Religious Developments*, pp. 256-257.
2 This was as early as 1654-1655 (*Friends' Hist. Soc. Trans.*, Suppt. 6, p. 22).
3 *Harleian MS.* 6207, ff. 43-59—'from Presteign Preson the 24 of the 9 mo : 81).
4 *The Sun Outshining the Moon* (1658), written by John Price and William Bound.
5 Joshua Thomas: *Hanes*, p. 259. Moon was with Parker; Bound was the Baptist.

under their feet. They had no leader like John Miles with his closely-woven dialectic, nor like Vavasor Powell, who could barb the darts of diatribe with quotations from the Fathers or from contemporary works of divinity. They lacked breadth of outlook. They had to pay the price of insularity. Bereft of English help, baited by the Quakers, badgered by Restoration spies—their lot was dismal indeed.

(iii) William Greene and Thomas Evans.

Do the licences issued in 1672-1673 enable us to mark a stage in this decay and fall? It requires but a moment's reflection to say they do *not*. If these Baptists were so primitive in type, so distrustful of the State connection as not to seek the favour of the Puritan Triers, there was very little likelihood of their appealing for the good offices of the Earl of Arlington. Whether they were few or many in 1672, the *Entry Book 38A* is the last place to find evidence one way or the other. For once they and their Quaker enemies were at one.

It is useless to weave theories about the Radnor followers of Vavasor who received licences, as he was the most hypercritical of Calvinists, and we must postulate the same of those who kept his memory green in his native county. It is a forlorn hope to read Arminian into the Brecknock licences, there being plenty of good evidence to prove these were either good Independents or 'free' Calvinistic Baptists taught and trained by Jenkin Jones. Two names remain: William Greene of Llandrindod and Thomas Evans of Llanafanfawr, both licenced as Baptist teachers, both on the same day,[1] and both living well within the geographical limits of the Arminian area. Greene may well have been the Greene of that name (spelt 'Green') who subscribed the *Humble Address* in 1656[2]; it is more certain he was *not* the somewhat indifferent innkeeper of Welshpool who allowed a roystering rector of Castell Caereinion to drink there for three days and 'keep a Coyle.'[3] Beyond that the records do not go. There is not the slightest evidence that he was an Arminian.

Of Thomas Evans it has been confidently asserted that he was one of them. It is not proposed here to expatiate

1 *E.B.*, p. 286 (on 3 Feb., 1672-1673, the last day of issue).
2 p. 10 (he comes next before that of John Miles.).
3 *Bodl. MS. Add.* c. 302 (Dolben Papers), f. 89^{v} (evidence given by Edward George on 5 Nov., 1662).

on the mistakes, on grounds personal as well as terminological, that Spinther fell into in making that assertion.[1] Let us say at once that the anti-Arminian arguments are very strong. During the Propagation and for some time afterwards, Evans was an itinerant preacher in the county of Radnor: yet when the Quaker John Moon gives a list of Arminian 'priests' at work in that county, Thomas Evans does not get a place.[2] When Maurice in 1675 refers to these Arminian Baptists, he mentions Henry Gregory as 'teaching elder,' but says not a word of Evans: if Evans were in fact one of them, he would surely be preferred to Gregory, who was a much younger man. In the last place, when his daughter Mary went to live in Bristol, it was not with the General Baptists of that town she sought membership, but with the Calvinists of Broadmead. The conclusion is irresistible that Thomas Evans was a 'free' Baptist and a follower of Vavasor Powell. Of the two licences, therefore, which are supposed to be Arminian, one has to succumb for lack of affirmative evidence, the other has to be surrendered because of the strength of the negative.

(iv) Signs of Life.

If a licence had been asked for under the Declaration, it would have been (without any doubt) for Henry Gregory to teach at the house of Peter Gregory in the parish of Llanddewi Ystradenny. That was their one meeting-place in 1675, says Henry Maurice. And the impression left by a collation of his Radnor and Brecknock entries is that this one roof could shelter all the Arminian remnants in the two counties. Important witness though Maurice is, such an interpretation of their numbers would be too low. For that inveterate anti-Arminian admits in his diary for 1672 that a woman of Radnor (evidently a distant sheep of his own Llanigon flock) had been sorely tempted by Satan to be rebaptised and to join the Arminians[3]: whether she was tempted by Satan or no, it was another way of saying that the virtue of making new conversions had not quite deserted

1 *Hanes y Bedyddwyr*, ii, 433-435; the writer has discussed this question in *Trans. Welsh Bapt. Hist. Soc.* (1916-1919), pp. 26-27.

2 *True Light* (quoted by Mr. Shankland in *Seren Gomer*, Nov. 1900, p. 324). It rather detracts from this point that the effusion of Moon was published in 1657 at a time when Evans had transferred his activities to North Brecknock. However, the Quaker *does* refer to other men who did not pay much attention to county boundaries.

3 Quoted in Dr. Thos. Rees: *Hist. Prot. Noncon.*, p. 221.

that body. Nor had the inclination to hold secret conventicles of their own, else how could their elder Gregory have his last cow sold to appease the Anglican sheriff of the county ?

Eleven years after the Indulgence five of these Baptists had enough courage to wend their way from Llanddewi to Milford and board a ship for Philadelphia.[1] Very soon a flourishing cause grew around them at Pennepec in Pennsylvania. But it is natural to think that these left behind at the old Radnorshire centre a goodly number of friends who did not feel quite equal to the perilous voyage across the Altantic. If the flag went down, it went down flying. To the last they aimed at conversions, did their share in braving the supreme authorities, and were not behind the Quakers in risking their lives on the ocean that carried them to freedom.

(v) Evanescence.

When the flag did dip, it dipped completely. In 1700 Henry Gregory passed away; in 1702 the only congregation that might have Arminians among its members quietly joined the Baptist Association of Wales, a body professing unadulterated Calvinism. More significant still, when Arminianism once more reared its head in Wales and caused a tumult at the Hengoed meetings of 1730, the men of Radnor and Brecknock made no response to it; when one of these new Arminian apostles came to Brecknock in 1732, he did not direct his steps to the haunts of the sometime General Baptists in the northern angle of the county, but stayed south of the Eppynt at Trecastell.[2]

In conclusion, something startling about the immigrants to Pennepec. In course of time (the year was 1701) there came to the same district sixteen emigrants from Rhydwilym. The followers of Calvin and Arminius dwelt amicably together as members of neighbouring congregations, until some disputes arose, *not* about the 'measure of light given by God to *every* man,' but concerning 'imposition of hands,' a tenet always very dear to the hearts of the men of Rhydwilym.[3] But according to the confessions of faith in vogue among the Arminian Baptists throughout the interregnum and after the

1 Joshua Thomas: *Hanes*, pp. 266-267.
2 *ib.*, p. 429. His name was Abel Francis; his text was Ez. xviii, 32.
3 *ib.*, p. 354.

Restoration, *this practice of imposing hands was even more jealously guarded by General Baptists than by the Particular.*[1] Another very curious and apposite illustration of how completely the Arminians of Wales had lost touch with the general development of their cause outside the Principality.

Thus by the 18th century the hearth of the sometime Arminians of Puritan Wales had grown so cold that the new Arminians made no effort to re-kindle a fire there, and the Radnor immigrants in America so oblivious of their prime customs as to attack Calvinists for defending a Scriptural custom they themselves ought to be particularly zealous in its defence. And the fact that men from Llanddewi could consort at all with those from Rhydwilym strongly suggests that they were much greater Baptists than they were Arminians. If the difficulties of the Restoration saw a steady diminution in the numbers of this Dissenting band, it is equally true to say there was a very perceptible relaxation in doctrine.

1 Prof. W. J. McGlothlin: *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, esp. pp. 108 (Art. 73), 113 (Art. v), 211 (Art. xxx).

XXI.

DIFFICULTIES OF ESTIMATION.

(i) Many Voices.

Quite apart from the Papist dilemma on which all Protestant nonconformists were perched and from the perplexing trilemma in which Philip Henry expressed the misgivings of the Presbyterian body, there were plenty of other awkward arguments which arose from and around the Declaration of March. Some good men were afraid of the King's assuming a general power above the laws, a heavy price indeed to pay for toleration; others said it would end, not in Blood's demand of 5/– per licence, but in a severe tax upon all licenced meetings and persons, as distinct from other subjects of the Crown; one timorous section prophesied a massacre, 'it being now known [by a visit to Arlington's offices] where such persons may be mett with' (a similar fear was harboured in 1687 by the Essex minister who quoted Nehemiah iv, 11[1]). These lachrymose sentiments having come to the ears of Henry were quoted by him in his diary for June and laughed out of court (he was at that time in the mood to manipulate his own teaching licence to its utmost limits): let us enjoy the King's supremacy, he writes, over bad laws like the Act of Uniformity; thousands of nonconformists are not cursed with but one neck to be cut off in a massacre. He lets the prospect of a severe tax severely alone.[2]

Henry's little joke notwithstanding, it was argued by a weighty and cogent writer of the time—the anonymous author of the *Queries upon the Declaration*—that by accepting the Indulgence nonconformists would openly admit the King's supremacy in religion, would confess he had the right to suspend old laws (good ones mayhap) and make new ones (possibly bad), agree that all disapproved or unsanctioned

1 Calamy: *Contin.*, i, 480.
2 p. 253 (3 June).

meetings were seditious conventicles, and tacitly admit that the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England was the rule and standard of the general public worship of God (as was expressly laid down in sec. 1 of the Declaration itself).[1] Arguing with Williamson in favour of a generous interpretation of the Indulgence four days after its issue, Dr. Nicholas Butler was unconsciously driving home the fears of this pamphleteer by his remark that such latitude would bring all the licenced ministers dependent upon His Majesty: 'if you have the ministers, you have all.'[2]

Ignorant of this intimate correspondence of the Doctor's, a somewhat guileless nonconformist tract-maker imagined he saw the fulfilment of Isaiah xxx, 20, where a hope was given of teachers coming out of their corners and of their people being able to see them once more[3]; and a Suffolk minister ejected after the Restoration preached at Walsham in the Willows on 23 April from John xi, 44, in parabolic language comparing Charles to the Saviour and himself to the resurrected Lazarus.[4] The practical Presbyterian of English Flint kept his feet more firmly on the ground. Henry did not attempt to distort a prophet's words or to make unconvincing comparisons. Rather did he take for his motto one of the general aphorisms of the Hebrew Preacher: 'he that observeth the wind shall not sow, & he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap.'[5]

But there is no disguising the very serious qualms of nonconformists about the unconstitutional use of the dispensing power and over the implied recognition of the royal supremacy in matters religious—together amounting to a denial of some of the most precious motives of the Puritan Revolution.

(ii) Addresses of Thanks.

Notwithstanding these conflicting opinions among the more orthodox Dissenters, material men behind the scenes saw to it that the King must at least be thanked for his gracious Declaration: on the morning of the 28 March Dr. John Owen, George Griffith and other

1 Quoted in Bate: *Decl.*, p. 88.
2 *O.R.*, iii, 192-193 (quoting *S.P. 30/*, 47—19 March, 1671-1672).
3 *Bate*, p. 88.
4 Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 786.
5 *Diaries* p. 253 (citing Ecclesiastes, xi, 4).

London Independents came to the presence for that purpose, followed in the afternoon by a deputation of the more prominent of the Presbyterian 'dons' (the 'ducklings' remained silent, but busily applied for licences).[1] The quiet suggestions of Dr. Butler in the capital were supplemented by the superabundant energy of the Puritan Hickes riding like a whirlwind into the south-west to persuade ministers to pour their blessings on the head of the King—Hickes was quite ready to write out the documents himself and even to fill in the names of the subscribers. Addresses of thanks from the country followed one another soon after, some full of fulsome flattery (especially those of Somerset and Gloucester),[2] others dignified and restrained, like that from 'the Baptised people in Dover.'[3]

In Wales neither individuals nor congregations responded. Two men, once connected with the Principality, were quite prominent in the Wiltshire address of gratitude. They were John Tombes and Benjamin Flower, the former's name appearing at the head of the list.[4]

(iii) Baptist Misgivings.

This reference to the great Baptist disputant induces the remark that as a body the Baptists of the country were particularly slow in availing themselves of the Indulgence: 350 licences, counting those for teachers and houses separately, had been recorded by Benson before he came to write the name of the first Baptist, Lawrence King of Oxford[5]; and 187 pages of the *Entry Book* have to be read before we come across the first Welsh Baptists, deliberately so called, licenced on 15 June. Kyffin, Knollys and Keach,[6] three of the most prominent names in that persuasion, seem never to have applied at all. Of the 236 *general* licences, only 13 were granted to Baptists, 9 of them on the same day of 16 May. And one of the 13, Francis Bampfield, cannot be proved to be a Baptist *in 1672*. This point, however, is not worth pressing very insistently, since

1 For both interviews, see *O.R.*, iii, 201, 596.
2 *S.P. 320*, 19, 140, 141; *S.P. 321*, 253, 321.
3 *ib.*, 81.
4 *ib.*, 160.
5 *E.B.*, p. 33 (19 April).
6 Perhaps Benjamin Keach had had enough of the State connection during his trial in 1665 for publishing 'a seditious and venomous book' in favour of adult baptism (Cobbett's *Compl. Colln. of State Trials*, vi, 701-710). His treatment by Lord Justice Hyde was only eclipsed by that of Baxter at the hands of Jeffreys in 1685.

only 27 such licences fell to the lot of the *Independents* of England and Wales. Neither Baptists nor Independents seem to have been very desirous of obtaining the 'general' permission to preach. Perhaps only 13 Baptists asked for them. Of those 61 representatives of the General Baptists (to come to more significant evidence) who drew up the Midlands Confession of 1651, not more than five appear among the licencees of 1672, either as teachers or otherwise, although five more of them were alive in 1669 to receive the attention of the informers. Were the others all dead? Of about a dozen signatories of a letter sent in 1653 by Baptists on the borders of Wales (and two or three within the border) to the church of Hexham,[1] only four appear in the Indulgence documents. It is too much to believe that all the rest had passed away. The natural inference is that they had determined to stay outside.

Just at this point a word is due concerning Colonel Thomas Blood and his supposed relations with the Baptists. When Philip Henry is referring to the Tower escapade, he is glad to call him an Anabapist,[2] and one might rashly conclude that Blood's intrigues in 1671-1672 were undertaken as the unofficial representative of that sect. Both are mistaken notions. Over 40 applications for licences were given in by him, of which 8 only were for Baptists: three of these were for Cranbrook in Kent, in which county the colonel had been in hiding just before his attack on Ormonde in 1671. The Baptists of Kent preferred to trust their interests in 1672 to more responsible men like John Seller and Richard Hobbs.

Returning from a digression entered upon to prove that the Baptist body had no official lot or part in the inception of the Indulgence, it must forthwith be added that no bias *against* them on the side of the authorities can be proved; indeed, after the early hesitation was overcome, Baptist teachers and householders are quite prominent in the later pages of the *Entry Book*. Important members of that denomination in England kept aloof; but equally important leaders—Bunyan, Ives, Gifford, Stennett, Cornewall—saw no great harm in applying. As for Wales, many outstanding

1 *Fenstanton Records* (including those of *Hexham*), ed. Underhill (1854), pp 341-346 (letter No. 19).
2 *Diaries*, p. 237 (under 5 May, 1671).

leaders (old and new) received licences. Probably the most important lay supporter of the Baptist cause in Wales at this time was Dr. Christopher Price of Abergavenny, a gentleman who not only took full advantage of the Indulgence of 1672, but lived fifteen years later to go to meet James II at Gloucester and thank him for the Indulgence of 1687.[1] Yet there was a considerable minority who did not agree with the Doctor's views either in 1672 or in 1687.

(iv) "The Phanaticks Would not Believe."

Some prominent leaders of Dissent were curiously inconsistent. Though the Baptist Kyffin never applied for himself, he helped *other* Baptists to get licences.[2] Dr. John Owen led a deputation of thanks, applied for a licence (at least the Society of Leather-sellers were willing to place their Hall at his disposal), for some unexplained reason did not get it, allowed a licence agent to use his house in Charterhouse Yard as a distributing centre, and acted as intermediary with Arlington's officials on behalf of some Dorsetshire Independents.[3] Different ground is reached when we read that out of 138 Devon ministers who were ejected in 1660-1662 and who did not conform afterwards, only about one-half applied for licences in 1672.[4]

And if this be true of the comparatively moderate Dissenters of Devon, what of those extremer elements in the country 'whose wild principles suffers them not to accept this act of soe great grace'? No 'connivance' (to use Dr. Butler's term and to quote another of his many generous suggestions) was forged to make the Indulgence satisfactory to them.[5] "*The phanaticks would not believe one that came to court though it were an angel.*"[6] The Quakers walked past contemptuously on the other side. The Fifth Monarchists also, in the main. A remark of Sir Joseph Williamson's concerning Butler's activities in 1671 makes allusion to John Rogers, whom Professor Lyon Turner takes to be Rogers the millenarian and alive in that year[7]; if that be a correct

1 *Rawlinson MS.* A. 139ᵃ, f. 151. The Doctor was an active preacher as well.
2 *Supra*, p. 106.
3 *S.P. 32/1*, 13, 97, 248.
4 *O.R.*, iii, 636.
5 *ib.*, 191-192.
6 A contemporary opinion cited by *Bate*, p. 74.
7 *O.R.*, iii, 189, n. †.

assumption, there is no record of his name in 1672. Of the three or four Baptists who figured as supporters of Venner the wine-cooper and Fifth Monarchist (either in his attempt of 1657 or that of 1661),[1] they are conspicuous by their absence. That interesting extremist named Studesbury of Broadly in Worcestershire who was accused of justifying Venner's treason, who boasted he had held a halberd at the trial of Charles I, and could repeat before the judge at Worcester Assizes in 1676 the exact words uttered by Bradshaw in 1649[2]—where was he in 1672-1673 ? His name cannot be found in the *Entry Book*. Nor the name of the Anabaptist silk-dyer Parrot who was Blood's accomplice at the Tower in 1671, and who was probably the person of that name hanged in 1685 for his part in Monmouth's rebellion.[3] That unnamed Herefordshire man, 'a schoaler in his language,' whom a spy heard holding forth at a Fifth Monarchy meeting in London early in 1668[4]—none of the Herefordshire names in *E. B. 38A*, orthodox and moderate members of the three chief sects, seem to allow any room for *him ;* the Independent preacher, carrying the piquant surname of Bishop, who talked so impertinently to a servant of the Bishop of Gloucester in 1669[5]—we search in vain for *his* reappearance as a licencee three years later. But is it not possible these had all applied for licences, only to be refused after the officials had made inquiries into their antecedents ? It is a fact that a Mr. Martin who lived in an alley off Coleman Street in London did make an application for his house to be licenced which was endorsed 'not appr.'[6] This makes Lyon Turner ask if he was not an old member of the Venner coterie.

Some attention has been paid to the attitude of these English extremists because Wales at one time, under the leadership of Vavasor Powell and Morgan Llwyd, numbered some of the most militant millenarians in Southern Britain. What did their survivors say in 1672 ? A good half dozen of Vavasor's old followers were granted licences without complaint or inquiry (as far as is known)—all anti-tithers and most

1 *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxv, 731, 744 (art. by Champlin Burrage on 'Fifth Monarchy Insurrections').
2 John Pollock: *The Popish Plot*, App. C, p. 390.
3 *O.R.*, iii, 230; W. C. Abbott: *Crown-Stealer*, p. 71.
4 *Extracts from St. Papers . . .* ed. Penney, p. 272 (letter from an 'intelligencer' named H. H. to Sir Robert Carr).
5 *Bodl. MS. Add.* c. 302, f. 181.
6 *O R.*, iii, 232.

turbulent of Fifth Monarchists in the days of the Protectorate. Two of these, Thomas Tonman of Nant Melan and Thomas Price of Glasgwm, were in later years in trouble at the Exchequer for refusing payment of tithes.[1] The Denbighshire licences contain a good sprinkling of Llwyd's sometime members at Wrexham. And who had given more obstruction to Royalist officers in 1660 than Jenkin Jones, licenced at Cilgerran as early as 8 May? We cannot escape from the conclusion that if the extreme fanatic chose to apply for a licence, very few questions were asked. But if Bishop Lucy speaks truth when he says that *un*licenced men went about to preach without compunction, does it not look a waste of time to seek the permission of Whitehall?

(v) Licences Unrepresentative.

After duly considering these factors—the movements of unlicenced men, conscientious objections to the interference of the State in matters of religion, the extremists' contempt towards the Indulgence—it follows quite irresistibly that the number of licences issued in 1672-1673 is nothing like a convincing indication of the area of nonconformist activity in England. For Wales a very convenient proof of the same thesis is found by bringing the licences face to face with the census returns of 1676, preserved at Stafford in the *Salt MS.* 2112. Large districts and important religious interests lie absolutely unrepresented, such as the Olchon Valley (then in the diocese of St. David's) with its 220 sectaries in 1676[2]; the Bettws-Diserth community in Radnor, 188 sectaries in 1676,[3] with no licence nearer than Llanfihangel Nant Melan; the 63 nonconformists of Cyfeiliog[4] and the 65 Puritans of Arwystli.[5] South-east Brecknock, the home land of Jenkin Jones, with well over 400 sectaries in 1676,[6] is represented by the one teaching licence issued to Lewis Prytherch at Llanfeugian on the last day licences were issued.

Plenty of other evidence is forthcoming to illustrate the argumentative limitations of the licences. The Pwllheli group

1 *Exchequer Bills & Ans.*, Radnor, No. 40, Trinity, 30 Chas. II, No. 6 Trinity and No. 8. Mich., 31 Chas. II (Tonman); Radnor, No. 47, Hilary, 32-33 Chas. II (Price).
2 f. 394.
3 f. 396.
4 ff. 415-416.
5 f. 408.
6 f. 396.

of documents is a colourless surface to the large Puritan underworld of pistol-men described in *Mostyn MS.* 237. Not a house or teacher was licenced in North Cardigan, a land where Evan Roberts had preached sermons both in Welsh and English, where John Lewis of Glasgrug had penned learned pamphlets in support of the Parliament, and where Vavasor Powell had held the historic conference of Llanbadarn. The Bapto-Independents of the Llandovery district, with their interesting leader Rhys Prytherch of Ystradwalter—he whose date of birth, ordination and death all fell on St. Paul's Day—made no sign. There is no proof that the Arminian eremites asked for a single licence; it is certain that the exclusionists of Rhydwilym—by March 1673 counting three elders, two deacons, and seventy baptised members—went on progressing under the Indulgence, never troubled the officials of Whitehall, and before a few months had passed were (on 27 September, 1673) baptising Philip David of Dihewid—who in the previous October had his house licenced 'Congregational.'[1] About fifteen prominent Independents mentioned as pastors and elders in Maurice's report of 1675 seemed to have treated the Declaration with contumely; so did six substantial gentlemen who acted as 'repetitioners' in Netherwent conventicles in 1669, only three years before (two of them were certainly alive in 1675); and the same attitude of aloofness was adopted by those eight stout Dissenters of the Wrexham and Holt neighbourhood who were protesting against the penalties of excommunication in 1665.[2] According to the *Entry Book*, there was not a single Puritan in all Anglesey, not a single Independent in all Flint (seeing that the clerk had misplaced William Jones of Plas Têg in Denbighshire), not a single Baptist in all North Wales—a trio of negatives which the records prove to be quite indefensible (were there not 5 Puritans in Anglesey in 1676![3]).

Nor is the licence record of any value in determining the relative strength of nonconformity in the different counties. One example will suffice: 39 licences were secured

1 Spinther James (*Hanes*, iii, 94) says he was a Baptist when licenced. It must be noted that there was a Philip David baptised on 6 June, 1668, but a collation of the 1668 and 1689 entries on the *Rhydwilym Register* proves *him* to have been from the parish of Llanllwni.

2 *Controlment Roll* 316, m. xxv, Hilary, 16-17 Chas. II.

3 *Salt MS.*, ff. 402-405.

in Monmouth, 631 Protestant sectaries there in 1676; 682 nonconformists in Brecknock in 1676, *six licences issued there in 1672-1673*. Barren Anglesey excepted, no county could show fewer licences than Brecknock; and yet behind the six licences it sheltered more Dissenters than any other of the thirteen (with the one exception of Glamorgan). We have the testimony of archdeacon Timothy Halton that that area was well furnished with conventicles in 1672[1]; the pages of the *Entry Book* speak eloquently in a negative fashion that their teachers and frequenters had no desire to obtain the official imprimatur of the Secretary of State.

Nor can the licences be in any way depended upon as a gauge of the proportionate strength of Dissent in the particular places for which they were granted. As one instance, and a sufficient one, three houses were licenced in Mynyddislwyn (38 nonconformists in 1676[2]), while Swansea with 292 Dissenters in that year[3] *only had one more house licenced in 1672 than Mynyddislwyn*. There is small hope of arriving at a mathematically correct estimate of Puritan strength from such a disintegrating set of factors.

(vi) Individual and Congregation.

Professor Lyon Turner adds still another factor to this problem by saying that the licences were only made out to *individuals*, a remark which ought to be strictly confined to the 236 'general' licences. In his preface to Volume II of the *Original Records*,[4] and a little less emphatically in Volume III, he will have it that in no single case was a licence issued to a community or congregation. The indubitable fact is that every personal licence, about 1,365 in number, was made out to '*the Teacher of the Congregation allowed by Us*,' as will be at once noticed by a re-examination of *S. P. 320*, 7. Indeed, such a licence always pre-supposed a congregation for each teacher, be it Presbyterially localised or Congregationally 'gathered,' besides implying it was only to *that* congregation he was to preach. The allusions to special meeting-places built for the

1 *St. Pap. Dom.*, Chas. II, 312, No. 1. In his summaries (*O.R.*, ii, 1211), Professor Lyon Turner enters this remark at the foot of his Baptist sub-division. There is nothing in the archdeacon's words to justify this. He also writes *Hatton* for *Halton* much in the same way as the late Llewelyn Williams put down *Halton* for *Hatton* (*Making of Mod. Wales*, p. 102, n. 1).

2 *Salt MS.*, f. 418.

3 *ib.*, f. 389—'town and parish.'

4 p. xii.

purpose can only mean meeting-places for congregations; nor can one ignore the six addresses sent to the King in which the petitioners refer to the organic entity of a 'church,' to the spiritual nucleus of a congregation. The mystery is that the learned Professor makes excellent point of this latter argument on a page of his preface next to the page where he says that, as far as the Indulgence State Papers go, there might not be a single Dissenting church in existence up to February 1673.[1] This stricture is to a large extent, but not altogether, true of the *Entry Book*, which supplies only the skeleton record of preachers licenced and places licenced for them. But what of the background of the actual licences, and of the significant words about the congregations found there in several memoranda in *S. P. 320 & 321*?

The Professor writes depreciatingly of the sub-title chosen by Frank Bate for his work on the Indulgence—*A Study in the Rise of Organised Dissent*—on the ground that there was no organisation to study.[2] But did not Robert Thomas take out his licence at Baglan to guide and guard the congregation he had gathered six years before? And one can see Hugh Owen infusing new life into the Merioneth congregation of Independents from his vantage-ground at Llanegryn, and the valetudinarian Higgs shaking off his melancholy to make full use of his five licences in Swansea and the peninsula of Gower. Bate's sub-title was *not* ill-conceived.

The exact membership of the separate congregations is nowhere given; they must be dimly seen through the dark glasses of the returns of 1669 and the census of 1676—the one with its fatal round numbers and the other with its 'Noncon^{ts}' jumbled together into one aggregate in the right-hand column of the *Salt MS.* The Indulgence officials laid an unconscious mortmain upon statistics.

1 Cp. *O.R.*, ii, Preface, pp. xii, xiii.
2 *O.R.*, iii, pp. 29, 740.

XXII.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

(i) **New Life and Leaders.**

Philip Henry's remark about the Indulgence of 1687 was that whatever the ends of men were concerning it, it was God's end 'to do us good.'[1] And notwithstanding his early misgivings fifteen years before about the tumbling down of the Presbyterian parish order by the issue of licences, that must have been his final opinion of the first Indulgence as well. His judgement was well attested by facts. The Declaration with its array of apparatus gave a mighty uplift to nonconformity. It gave it a new lease of life; better still, in Seaton's vivid phrase, 'the ocean-current of popular feeling set towards toleration.'[2] There is the testimony of archdeacon Samuel Parker of Canterbury that many left the Church of England 'upon the late Indulgence' who frequented it before[3]; a Yorkshire magnate declared it was the greatest blow to the Church since the Restoration, a conclusion that suggested itself to the diarist Evelyn in almost the same words[4]; there are also the depressing letters of Bishop Lucy to his metropolitan over the spread of unlicenced schools, over the nomadic activities of Stephen Hughes in Carmarthenshire and of Henry Maurice in Brecknock. 'Ancient followers' and 'old hearts' in Welsh Flint felt the force of the new reverberation: the few Puritans surviving there cast off their lethargy, joined together, began to hold a 'constant private meeting.'[5] Lleyn Dissenters flocked to hear the son of Methlan on his visit to the peninsula in the late summer of 1672; Philip Henry reported a great

1 *Diaries*, pp. 327-328.
2 *Theory of Toleration*, p. 322.
3 *Lambeth MS. 639*, f. 168 v—observation 1, in letter to Archbishop, dated 13 Apr., 1676 (enclosing returns of the census).
4 *Memoirs and Travels of Sir John Reresby*, ed. Ivatt, p. 150; *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn*, ed. Bray, ii, 71. For the opinion of the Bishop of Lincoln, see *C.S.P.*, 1672, p. 589 ('the orthodox poor clergy are put out of heart').
5 *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 513.

appearance of people at Marton in Salop, an 'incouraging Auditory' (including several persons of quality) at Drayton.[1]

There are frequent references (but not in Wales) to the building of new meeting-places for Dissenters or to the adaptation of secular buildings for that purpose: let us give the example of the second Edmund Calamy setting men to work to get the Curriers' Hall in St. Alphege Parish ready for his congregation (it would take them a week, he thought).[2] The Presbyterians began to hold public ordinations for the ministry as of old: Alexander Gordon states definitely that the ordination of Robert Eaton at Deansgate, Manchester, on 29 October, 1672, was the first since the Restoration.[3] Persecution had left Puritanism a living faith.

The coming of the Indulgence and the comparative liberty which had preceded it served to accelerate several changes of habitat, so that old causes are found in 1672 in command of new leaders: John Evans, reported as holding conventicles in 1669 at Llanfyllin, moved further north by 1672 to gather once more the interesting flock once ministered to by Llwyd and Ambrose Mostyn[4]; Thomas Quarrell moves east from Whitchurch in Glamorgan to superintend the free communionists of Llantrisant; the mantle of Miles fell upon the shoulders of Lewis Thomas of Newton Nottage, who left his farmhouse at the Mŵr, and departed west for Swansea. Nor did the difficulties of later days move any of the three to strike camp again. Thus the events of 1672-1673 made for stability: in some cases they brought home exiled ministers; others they confirmed in the new homes they had perforce acquired; in the instances just mentioned they see the final settlement of men, made weary by the tribulations of the penal code, in those spheres of activity which have made both men and places famous.

(ii) The Dominant Sects.

In Wales the licences served to bring into the limelight the overpowering hold of the Independents. After including in their ranks men wrongly described

1 *Diaries*, pp. 253, 256.
2 *S.P. 320*, 34 (letter to James Innes, senior, dated 6 April, 1672).
3 *Freedom after Ejection*, p. 257. Alas for the Presbyterian ideal, Eaton had been licenced to preach by the Whitehall officials six months *before* his ordination to preach was solemnised (*E.B.*, p. 51, under 30 April).
4 Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 842, states he had come to Wrexham as early as February, 1667-1668. This does not agree very well with the conventicle reports of 1669, which do not in any way associate him with Wrexham.

as Presbyterians and taking from them the Baptist masqueraders, they claim no less than 126 out of the 185 issued, more than two out of every three. *Wales was the most Independent part of the British Isles.*

On the other hand, the Indulgence put a sudden end to the Bapto-Independent concordats of 1669: Lewis Thomas is no more at Newton Nottage aiding and abetting the Independent Richard Cradock to defeat the attentions of the informers, but setting up as a distinctive Baptist preacher at the house of William Dykes in Swansea. "Old differences among Dissenters themselves reasserted themselves" (Baxter).[1] Thus the licencing of 'separate places' involved consequences in which Philip Henry would take little interest —the segregation of Baptists from Independents and the re-hardening of the Baptist creed.

The licences also defined very clearly the districts and places where the uncompromising gospel of Miles had taken firm hold—the nodus of Llangennech, the undulating lands on both sides of the Ogmore, the town and neighbourhood of Swansea. It was most important to preserve the Baptist conquests at Abergavenny and to prevent the Baptists of Olchon, shut up as they were by the obscuring mountains, from losing contact with the Baptists of Wales—both ends were strategically secured by the licence granted to William Prichard to preach at his house in Llantilio Pertholy: it will be remembered that it was he who officially carried the traditions of Ilston to Rhydwilym in 1668, and that the journey was made in the company of Thomas Watkins of Olchon. What with Lewis Thomas at Swansea and William Prichard at Llantilio the Baptist succession was safe: future events were to prove that the apostacy at Eglwysilan[2] and the deceptive prosperity of the 'open' communionists of Monmouth would count little against the remorseless advance of an exclusionist creed professed by a body of strict disciplinarians.

On close examination the sadly shorn Presbyterian licences reflect the activities of two men, one in the North and one in the South. What survived of the system after the day of Philip Henry and Samuel Jones ran into strange

1 Calamy's *Abridgement*, i, 335.
2 *Supra*, pp. 200-201.

channels, until the new Methodist revivals in more accommodating times reharnessed the 'monthly meeting' on the back of a nation which has borne it with surprising docility. To keep to the text, the years 1672-1673 witnessed the triumphant emergence of the Congregational school, the survival by its side of a strict Baptist dogma of great penetrative power, and the failure of moderate Presbyterians to appeal to the bellicose instincts of young Dissenters bred upon controversy, with their teeth set on edge by persecution.

(iii) Food for Pessimism.

Unrepresentative though the licences were, containing though they did some of the worthiest names in the religious history of this country, it would be idle to argue that Welsh nonconformists in 1673 were proportionally large in number. Maurice's report of two years later is full of interesting and exclusive information, but his references to 'shattered societies' and dead pastors do not make a rosy picture. A year after that came the census with its total of about 4,200 Protestant sectaries in the four dioceses. But did not the Conformists in that year 1676 come up to nearly 155,000 and the Papists number well over 1,000 ?[1] And let it not be disregarded that the *Salt MS.* reports no less than 427 parishes with not a single Dissenter within their four corners and 283 others with numbers varying from 1 to 10.

No three centres in the history of Welsh Puritanism affect its fortunes more closely than Ilston, Mydrim and Llangwm in Pembroke. Not a single Dissenter was counted in the whole three in 1676.[2] There were only 4 in Llanfaches.[3] It is a melancholy reflection that in a high ratio of districts where preachers or houses were licenced in 1672 the numbers of nonconformists found in them four years later were placed at a very low total. Bettws by Newport and Uzmaston in Pembroke had none.[4] It is consoling to know—evidence to such effect is rapidly accumulating—that the nonconformist numbers in the census of 1676 were seriously underestimated.

1 The complete figures, counting not only the four Welsh dioceses but portions of Wales then lying within English bishoprics, stand as follows :—*Conformists*, 155,656 ; *Papists*, 1,122 ; *Nonconformists*, 4245 (Suppt. Trans. Cymm., 1925-1926, 118. 4,445 is a misprint).

2 *Salt MS.*, ff. 384, 387, 388.

3 *ib.*, f. 419.

4 *ib.*, ff. 385, 418.

(iv) Puritan Continuity.

A remnant they might be, but not discredited (to quote Pollock's unfortunate word[1]); as to Seaton's aphorism that the Dissenters generally were now living *down* their dreadful past in the interregnum,[2] the arresting truth is that those of Wales were rather living *up* to it. Deserted by an array of conformist brethen and by the lay lovers of the loaves and fishes, harassed as they had been by ancient enemies and by some of their own former patrons, the Puritans of the principality gave wonderful evidence of their steadfastness in the faith. The prosaic truncations of the *Entry Book* are full of this poetry of life.

Of those ministers ejected from their livings between 1660 and the end of 1662, no less than 25 received licences; an appeal to Calamy's record of 'silenced' candidates and to the lists of unpaid preachers outside the Puritan State system adds eight more at least; of ministers and householders who were reported as conventiclers in 1669, 21 reappear in 1672 to receive the benediction of the King; fellow-sufferers under the Code[3] (like Jacob Christopher and Lewis Alward at Kenfig) figure as teachers and welcoming householders under the Declaration (in the case quoted, Christopher was to be teacher at Alward's house). Three surviving Commissioners for the Propagation, all North Welshmen—Luke Lloyd of Bryn, William Wynn of Cristionydd, Richard Price of Gunley—are not afraid to re-assert their principles in 1672, two of them as teachers; two others, Richard King of Llanbister and Rice Williams of Newport, are represented by their respective widows; a fifth was William Blethin of Dinham: he was reported in 1669,[4] allowed the Indulgence to pass by unheeded, only to reappear in 1675 as a pillar of Thomas Barnes' congregation in the moors by Severn Sea.[5] Old soldiers of the Puritan army gave welcome to Daniel Higgs in Gower; and though Lieutenant Henry Williams of Marshfield had passed away, his relict welcomed conventiclers at her house in 1669 and furnished it as a licenced meeting-place for Independents three years later. Thomas Quarrell

1 *The Popish Plot*, pp. 282-283 (he refers to England and Wales).
2 *The Theory of Toleration*, p. 322.
3 *C.S.P.*, 1663-1664, pp. 568-569.
4 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 186b.
5 *Broadmead Recs.*, p. 516.

was not inconversant with arms, but he would have to preach at Shirenewton without the sword which used to dangle from his belt in the old days.[1]

Three analogous cases follow, but without military associations. The William Richards whose house at Llangwm was licenced for William Milman had himself in 1656 seconded Cradock in holding up the arms of the Protector. The Watkin Cradock who was teacher at his own house at Newton Nottage in 1672 must have been son or brother to the Richard Cradock who was preaching secretly there in 1669.[2] And there is the strongest probability that Joan Jones who had her house called 'y^e^ Milton' licenced at Christchurch in 1672[3] was the widow of the Thomas Jones who harboured Dissenters in 1669 at his house in Monmouth St. Bride's, at a house also called 'y^e^ Milton' (the two districts are tolerably near and the name of the house is too peculiar to be easily duplicated). Very noteworthy in their way are three other pairs of facts: the names of Walter Williams and Edward Waters are found next to each other on the *Humble Address* of 1656, and it was in Waters' house in Llangibby that Williams preached both in 1669 and in 1672; a similar coincidence occurred over the preacher and householder at Llanfeugian in Brecon, with the difference that these two signed Vavasor's *Word for God*[4]; in the *Humble Address* of South Wales Puritans to Cromwell Peregrine Phillips is within two names of the Richard Meyler of Haverfordwest at whose house he had a complementary licence in 1672.[5]

Having expatiated on these coincidences, it is just a little unfortunate that the evidence is not quite complete enough to equate Morgan Llwyd's mother with the Cynfal licencee in Merioneth, nor his son Joshua with the general teacher of south-eastern Monmouth. Nor can any of the Thomas Joneses (one at Eglwysilan, the other at Bedwellty) be said to answer to the description of Walter Cradock's son-in-law

1 Joshua Thomas: *Hanes*, p. 251.

2 Mr. D. Rhys Phillips claims Richard Cradock as a member of the Cradocks of Cwrt Rhydhir by Neath Abbey and breaks the unpleasant news that he conformed at the parish church of Newton Nottage in 1684 (*Hist. Vale of Neath*, 405). Both these contentions are seriously discredited by an entry in an old Llangyfelach non-parochial register (*Trans. Carm. Antiq. Soc.*, xl, 51).

3 *S.P. 321*, 373.

4 The noteworthiness of this contact would cease if it were ever proved that the David Williams who signed the *Word* was not the householder of Llanfeugian, but the Talgarth teacher of that name.

5 'Rayler' in the *Address* (p. 9).

of that name.[1] Vavasor died childless two years before the Declaration ; but his widow married John Evans of Oswestry and Wrexham, and became the mother of the Dr. John Evans who compiled the nonconformist *Lists* of 1714-1719.

The passing on of the Puritan torch deserves further emphasis and illustration. The crying vice of the interregnum was the materialism which had woven itself into the inner fibre of a great spiritual movement. It was against this insidious Mammonism that William Erbery of Cardiff thundered out his protest when he decided to abjure the official Propagation and to refuse taking his salary as preaching minister from the South Wales treasurer.[2] It is very doubtful whether *he* was fully aware how far the evil had spread—Walter Cradock involved in the buying up of 'sequestered' estates,[3] Llwyd's acquired interest in the Trefalun tenement,[4] Vavasor's threat to bring a troop of soldiers to overawe a refractory tenant at New Radnor,[5] Richard Symonds the 'approver' paying over £550 for a fee-farm rent once belonging to the Bishop of Llandaff,[6] and honest Colonel John Jones joining with the Saxon Twisleton to get a big bargain over manors annexed to the forfeited interests of the ex-Bishops of St. Asaph and Bangor.[7] Officials swarmed everywhere in Puritan Wales—sequestrators, collectors, receivers, and other motley Parliamentary agents, the bureaucratic fingers of the military arm. Though they all affected the name of Puritans, it was a term that covered many sins and much self-interest.

But the vicissitudes of the Restoration restored Puritanism to itself : the entries of 1672 prove that a sturdy devotion to an unpopular faith was not quite overwhelmed in the days of prosperity, that convictions flourished in the shade as well as in the sun. Otherwise how is one to explain farmers of sequestered livings like Lewis Alward and Llewellyn Morgan,[8] a collector of sequestered rents like George Morgan

1 Dr. Thos. Rees : *Hist. Prot. Noncon.*, pp. 50-51 (confirmed by *Lambeth MS.* 1027, Report No. 23).

2 *H.P.M.*, 162. This dramatic incident happened in 1652.

3 *Cal. Comm. Compounding*, iii, 1714 ; v, 3066. In addition to the transactions recorded here Sir Joseph Bradney assures me Cradock was concerned also in the purchase of lands at Redwick by Magor.

4 *Gweithiau*, ii, 279-280.

5 *Thurloe St. Papers*, ii, 118 (intercepted letter, dated 25 Feb., 1653-1654).

6 *Rawlinson MSS. B.* 239, p. 29, No. 373.

7 *ib.*, p. 48, No. 524.

8 Alward (looks like 'Edward' in MS.) at Pyle and Kenfig in 1651-1652 (*MS. J. Walker*, c. 13, ff. 19, 21), Morgan at Llangynwyd in 1652 (*ib.*, f. 21).

of Llantrisant in Monmouth who figured in the Caldicot indemnity case after the Restoration,[1] a tenant of a Pembrokeshire rectory like Richard Meyler[2] and of a Monmouthshire living like Evan Williams,[3] higher Propagation officials like Christopher Price and William Watkins of Llanigon—how is one to explain their continuing loyalty to the Puritan faith except on the ground of solid convictions ? Did not whilom 'understrappers'[4] of Colonel Philip Jones put to shame in 1672 the great opportunist who was responsible in 1658 for the funeral arrangements of Oliver Protector ? To use the words found in the Hebrew prophet, the dross was purged off and the tin all taken away (Isa. i, 25).

This process of purification found one of its best exemplars in Howell Rees, a humble householder of Merthyr Tydvil. If we are to believe all that rector Nathaniel Jones had to say of Howell's dishonest detention of tithe in the days of the interregnum, he must have fallen very far indeed from the higher ideals of the Puritan faith.[5] The Restoration at once denied him all opportunity of misappropriating tithes and supplied a moral touchstone for his real convictions : he must have been one of those who went out fearlessly in 1668 to hear Vavasor Powell preaching in the churchyard ; in 1669 he was giving harbour to an inordinate number of conventiclers ; as an advanced Puritan he was among the very last to receive a licence for his house in 1673.[6] Almost always is he found in the closest association with the old Merthyr preacher Henry Williams. If Nathaniel Jones managed to keep up his courage amongst the turbulent Dissenters of the Upper Taff, Howell Rees was equally daring in braving the enmity of the degenerate persecutor who had followed Nathaniel in the rectory of Merthyr.[7] Nathaniel Jones gives the impression that the Puritans of the area were all hypocrites. The tenacity of Howell Rees proves the old rector to have been wrong. In short, the licenced householder

1 *Exch. Bills & Ans.*, Mon., No. 2, Mich., 13 Chas. II (evidence of defendant William Blethin) ; confirmed by *MS. J. Walker*, c. 13, ff. 49-58 (Monmouth).
2 *MS. J. Walker*, c. 13, f. 10 (1651).
3 *ib.*, f. 47 (1650).
4 The term used of some of the Gower licencees by Edward Mansell in 1709 (*MS. J. Walker*, c. 4, f. 72).
5 *Cymmrodor*, xxxv (1925), pp. 182-183.
6 For these points, see *Life of Vavasor Powell* (1671), p. 133 ; *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 187 ; *E.B.*, p. 287.
7 Gregory Jones (*Life of Powell*, p. 133 ; *Exch. Bills & Ans.*, Glam., No. 59 Mich., 35 Charles II).

of 1673 was no unworthy disciple of the Blaencanaid tradition and of the preaching of Jenkin Jones.

(v) Social Status.

Nor did Dissent lack the support of men who stood somewhat higher in worldly estimation than the former Puritan bureaucrats, men such as the wealthy impropriators of county Carmarthen—'leading men of the county'—who gave countenance to Stephen Hughes.[1] Though Richard Edwards of Nanhoron and Charles Lloyd of Gwernyfed do not appear on the licence-entries, the hospitable welcome given under their roofs to Henry Maurice requires no further elaboration: both lived to see another Indulgence and both remained Dissenters. Who could guess from the obscure licence record of Bodvel House that the interest of a Lord Privy Seal was behind it, that the old mansion was in the possession of a future Viscount and ambassador to Denmark, though but a few years before it was the home of a Cavalier colonel and a commissioner of array?[2] Two Kynastons, John and Roger, opened their doors to Puritan preachers in 1672: the latter was the son of an old Parliamentary sympathiser who lived at Cefn Carneddau near Wrexham[3]; the former lived at Bryngwyn in Montgomery, allowed his servant Baxter to be one of the teachers at the Llanfechain conventicle in 1669,[4] openly proclaimed his own attitude three years later, and proclaimed it more emphatically still in the persecution that followed in the reign of Charles II.[5] It is only natural to find Rees Powell of Goitrehen kept loyal to the old cause by his own instincts and by the fortifying presence of his doughty son-in-law, Samuel Jones of Llangynwyd.

It would be but poetic justice to discover that the Thomases of Wenvoe had once more felt the Puritan impetus which led young Edmund Thomas to Cromwell's 'Other House' and his sister Elizabeth to ally herself in marriage with the immaculate republican Edmund Ludlow.[6] But the writer

1 *Tanner MS.* 146, ff. 113, 138.
2 This situation has been discussed at some length above (pp. 152-153). Perhaps the phrase 'in the possession of' is rather too strong for the ascertained evidence about the disposition of the Bodvel property in 1672.
3 A. N. Palmer: *Hist. Older Noncon. of Wrexham*, p. 48.
4 *Lambeth MS.* 639, f. 139b.
5 Philip Henry: *Diaries*, p. 274.
6 R. Dunlop: *Ireland under the Commonwealth*, i, p. 58 (n. 1); Ludlow's *Memoirs*, ed. Firth, i, 258, n. 1.

has failed to find any point of contact between the Morgan Thomas of that place who permitted Joshua Miller to preach at his house and the aforesaid Edmund[1] (the Edmund who had issued an order to apprehend Vavasor Powell in 1668 and yet was pleased later to see his son William marry a daughter of the great Whig house of Wharton[2]).

As some solace for the Wenvoe disappointment, let us proceed to note that some of the licenced ministers were not exactly stricken with poverty: did not Robert Thomas of Baglan live in a Hall, John Hanmer of Llanbister 'live well on his Estate,'[3] and Stephen Hughes marry a rich wife? Nevertheless, the great majority of the preachers were poor men, the greater proportion of their listeners of little worldly consequence. But who would say that the nonconformity of John Rowlands of Eifionydd was less vigorous on his one hearth than on that of the Penyrwrlodd squire with eight?[4]

(vi) Varieties of Experience.

Equally important was the projection into the Restoration world of those picturesque developments of the Puritan polity which had enlivened the imagination of men in the 'late times.' Old sufferers under the High Commission find a representative in Marmaduke Matthews; the South Wales preaching crusade of 1646, reluctantly blessed by the Westminster Assembly, has its survivor in Henry Walter, the same Henry Walter who had been named by William Wroth as the legal executor of his last will and testament[5]; George Robinson is still alive to preach at Llantrisant the 'damnac'on' he once hurled at the head of an audience in Llantilio Crossenny[6]; two of the Mynyddislwyn school of itinerants, lacking letters but full of enthusiasm, are grouped together in the same district in 1672; the Welsh preaching soldier answers the new trumpet-call at Merthyr Tydvil and Shirenewton. An English immigrant like Daniel Higgs is as busy in the work as a full-blooded Cymro like Stephen Hughes.

1 There is no reference to this Morgan Thomas in G. T. Clark's *Limbus Patrum* (1886), either on pp. 444-446 or pp. 558-559.

2 *Life and Times of Anthony Wood* (ed. Clark), iii, 465-466.

3 *Gordon MS.*, f. 94. It was in 1666 Robert Thomas was described as 'of ye hall in Bagland'; in 1687 he lived at Pen-y-Gisla in that parish (*Trans. Margam Hist. Soc.*, 1924, p. 50).

4 *Lay Subsidy Rolls* (temp. Charles II), cp. 264/29 with 219/63. On re-examination of the first roll I find it refers to John Rowlands of Ceidio in Llcyn. The contrast in the text shall stand till it is discovered that the Llangybi farmhouse was assessed at more than one hearth.

5 *Trans. Cardiff Naturalists' Soc.*, xxv, pt. ii, 7.

6 *Diary of Walter Powell* (ed. Sir Joseph Bradney), p. 42.

Old disputants, subscribers respectively of the anti-Protectorate *Word* and the pro-Cromwellian *Address*, have both found the name of Oliver a memory to cherish rather than a tyrant to curse ; and men who penned fiery resolutions against State maintenance are willing to apply for licences that cost them nothing (or next to nothing). Fifth Monarchy was not dead. And what must have been the restrained joy of the Montgomeryshire Friends when those eleven men and women—Quakers who had remained in prison 'for not sweareing' above 'seven yeares'—were set free by the Indulgence![1]

Young men at the Restoration, like Hugh Owen of Bronyclydwr, must through their wonderful energy have gladdened the hearts of old professors and preachers like Robert Fogg ; a converted character like Morgan Howell would from his new pedestal view with contumelious regret the reasons which led his sometime minister Rice Powell to join the ranks of the Church[2] ; chequered conformists like Henry Maurice rose to such high Puritan stature as to give lectures to a cousin who had never dreamt of conforming. Last of all, it may with some confidence be predicated that the insistence laid by that same cousin, John Williams of Ty'nycoed in Lleyn, on the prime necessity of preaching Christ and his merits as the only justification of a sinner,[3] is as potent a sign of continuity as any. Continuity in the midst of variety. For it was the re-assertion of respect for that doctrine of high Calvinism which was always preached by Cradock and Powell and Miles. Maurice immediately responded to his cousin's adjurations by preaching on the morrow from 1 Peter iv, 8, and Romans v, 8.

(vii) Irreconcilables.

Thus (it is well worth repeating) the short-lived Indulgence emphasised the Independent hegemony, crystallised the Baptist creed, dissolved the dream of Presbyterian comprehension, witnessed the efflorescence of Dissenting schools, and furnished a remarkable proof of the organic unity of Puritanism with its glories in the past. It also brought into clear relief those extremer elements which always assembled

1 *Extracts from St. Papers* . . . ed. Penney, p. 354.
2 *Supra*, p. 156, n. 2.
3 This was at the interview of 14 Sept., 1672 (Dr. Thos. Rees : *Hist. Prot. Noncon.*, p. 217).

on the left wing of the Protestant and Puritan revolutions. Many of them, however, not too extreme to apply for licences.

In some respects the submerged world of unlicenced preachers outside the Indulgence was more suggestive and significant ; with their deep-rooted objection to any form of State interference they bequeathed that quasi-Erastian anti-ecclesiastical legacy which in later generations was to produce Liberationists and disestablishers. The sharpest weapons in the nonconformist armoury had been forged at least a full half-century before the advent of the Methodist Revival. That movement was to enrich and vivify the Puritan world of Wales in many wonderful ways, more especially in re-introducing a system of church-government in direct contrast to the centrifugal polity of the Independents. But the Methodist leaders, whether Calvinist or Arminian, broke away from the Mother Church with evident reluctance, an attitude typified not only by Thomas Charles and John Elias, but by Edward Matthews and some of those more modern leaders who agitate piously for Reunion.

Seventeenth century Puritanism was less respectful and more revolutionary. The Dissenters bred by the Civil War never forgot the execution of John Penry ; the nonconformists of the mid-Restoration period derived their great inspiration from the last days of Vavasor Powell in prison. In the records of the Indulgence we are allowed a glance at this small but invincible band, tenacious in their beliefs and bitter in their animosities, moving in and out of their meeting-places. Behind them was the Code of Clarendon. Before them lie the breaking of the Broad Seal and the revocation of the licences.

NOTE : BARBARA WILLIAMS of Newport (p. 230).

Her house was licenced as a ' place ' on 10 August (*E.B.*, p. 231). In this chapter she has been assumed to be the widow of the Rice Williams of that town who had been Commissioner for the Propagation from 1650 to 1653, and who (according to one of Alexander Griffith's most sardonic touches) was taken by one of Vavasor Powell's itinerants to be a man after the Saviour's own build and appearance, with a similar large grey beard ! (*Strena Vavasoriensis*, p. 6). Sir Joseph Bradney, usually so well-informed in the minutiæ of Monmouthshire history, has hardly anything to say of Rice Williams, and is unable to agree or disagree with the assumption stated in the text. Men who ought to know differ strangely about the date of his death. We have the word of Walter Jones, petty constable of the parish of Llandenny,

that Rice was father-in-law to Edward Herbert of 'Couldrey' and dead before June 1662 (*Lambeth MS.* 1027, Rpt. No. 23); the Anglican informer of 1669, no doubt the then vicar of St. Woollos, describes the old Commissioner so much alive as to be one of the teachers at the Newport conventicle in that year (*Lamb. MS.* 639, f. 188). Perhaps the petty constable was confusing him with a *Roger* Williams of Newport. He actually calls him by that name in one of his statements. To prove Barbara's widowhood, it is not necessary for her husband to have died before 1662 or in 1669, but some time before August in 1672. But did Rice Williams marry a lady of that name, was it not possible for the Propagation Commissioner and the conventicler of 1669 to be father and son or even members of quite different families? The writer is glad to take shelter behind the silence of the Monmouth historian and the fact that the Newport parish registers do not open before 1702.

XXIII.

THE BREAKING OF THE BROAD SEAL.

(i) Drums Ecclesiastic.

Earlier on in this work it was found necessary to quote the Snowe-Heywood incident, the ecclesiastical opposition to the licencing of parochial buildings, and the secret correspondence of Dr. Nicholas Butler with Arlington's chief secretary Williamson in order to combat Seaton's ill-starred remark about an alliance between the Church and the Dissenters.[1] At the beginning of this last chapter it is very expedient to hark back to the same happenings. To the average Churchman the Indulgence was an abomination. If an Anglican so learned and pious as Herbert Thorndike maintained (two years before 1672) it was such a degree of disgrace to stand excommunicate from the National Church that he was ready to forbid Christian burial to all who had not received Holy Communion within the year,[2] how would he view the tacit suspension of attendance at church by sec. 2 of the Declaration? Dr. Edward Stillingfleet, angered by his recent unsuccessful dialectic in the Tower with the younger Penn[3] and still more by the renewed activities of 'dons' and 'ducklings' in 1672, was developing those uncompromising arguments which made him in works published a few years later attack 'separation' as full of mischief and against all reason.[4]

Coming to Primate Sheldon himself, three years before the Declaration he was listening at Lambeth House to a sermon on Psalm cxxxvii, 2, designed to parody the grimaces and voice of 'a presbyter Scot,' an incident which to his

1 Another incident may be added here. In August 1672 a William Battie of Suffolk was writing to Williamson to 'pray endeavour that I may have no houses licenced in Witsham [Witnesham] or Bawdsey' (*C.S.P.*, 1672, p. 543). He finds time for such a prayer from amidst the anxious duty of looking out for the approach of Dutch ships.

2 A. A. Seaton: *Theory of Toleration*, p. 193, n. 1.

3 *Extracts from St. Pays. . . . Friends*, ed. Penney, p. 279.

4 *Theory of Toleration*, pp. 193-194, 197-198.

biographer bespeaks a sense of humour[1]; good men of all creeds would rather say it was conduct unworthy in a man who hoped to leave the world better than he found it, much more so in an Archbishop who in 1670 was unctuously lecturing capitular dignitaries on decency and good order.[2] Two years before the Declaration, in the same year 1670, this ecclesiastical statesman hoped to dragoon Puritans into conformity by God's help, the censures of the Church, 'and the assistance of the civil power' (his letter to the bishops laid especial emphasis on the third[3]). To a *stator ecclesiae* whose aims and ambitions for twelve years had been brought to the dust, the Indulgence was more abhorrent than to either Thorndike or Stillingfleet. During 1672 little is heard of him except that on 1 August he was marrying Arlington's only daughter Isabella (a child of five !) to one of the King's natural sons[4]—the father of the bride the State official whose signature was essential for the efficacy of nonconformist licences, the father of the groom the monarch whose exercise of the dispensing power had made the signatures possible. Needless to say, the King and his Secretary of State took a holiday from that work on August 1. And the Archbishop had to look on and quietly bide his time.

So did the ordinary cleric on the countryside, men like the Anglican minister of Drayton (Millington by name) who detested the Dissenters that preached in the district because they had not first asked *his* advice,[5] and Joseph Hanmer, the former Puritan curate of Whitwell in the Iscoed township who had been admitted Anglican rector of Marchwiel on 21 April, 1668,[6] who is described by Philip Henry as being content 'in our present liberty, but not pleased.'[7] It was not surprising that the Chancellor of St. David's was busy trying to catch up the band of preachers in that diocese who could show no licence whatsoever.[8]

Behind the Archbishop and the clergymen were the angry ranks of Cavaliers, whether M.P.'s forced to sit down sullenly

1 Vernon Staley: *Life*, pp. 110-111, 181; Samuel Pepys: *Diary*, ed. Gregory Smith, pp. 751-752 (14 May, 1669).
2 Edward Cardwell: *Documentary Annals*, ii, 280-281.
3 See reference *supra*, p. 67.
4 Vernon Staley: *Life of Sheldon*, pp. 117-118; Sergeant: *My Lady Castlemaine*, pp. 195-196.
5 Philip Henry: *Diaries*, p. 256 (under 2 Oct., 1672).
6 *First Fruits Certifs.*, St. Asaph, File 15.
7 *Diaries*, p. 260 (under 23 Jan., 1672-1673). Cp. also pp. 58, 125.
8 *Tanner MS.* 146, f. 138v.

at home to see ' all sectaries repairing publicly to their meetings and conventicles ' or county squires (like those of Lleyn) who forced Dissenters to meet at night, so ' fearful ' they were. At places *not* licenced, it must be understood. Actual evidence of interference with the conduct of licenced meetings in Wales is not forthcoming, the nearest being an incident at Orleton in Herefordshire where drums were beat in the street to prevent William Woodward (licenced on 17 April) to preach at his opening meeting on a week-day.[1] If the *Broadmead Records* are read aright, churchwardens and clergy in the city of Bristol did their best to forget that sec. of the Declaration which assured to the Dissenters peaceable enjoyment of their meeting-places.[2]

The application of David Clarkson of Mortlake and the letter of Thomas Brand of Kent prove that many nonconformists were under no delusion that the Indulgence was to last indefinitely : the former desires an agent to move with all expedition ' that we may lose no time in improveing the advantage offered '[3] ; the latter had heard that their opponents were resolved to try the strength of the Declaration ' whether 'twill be valid ag^t^ an act of Parliament.' Trouble, added Brand in a pessimistic note, will come in the end notwithstanding a licence. He recounts how he was sent for the week previous by a local J.P. to know whether his official licence had arrived from London, and how the day before it was only the influence of a Kentish lady to whom he acted as chaplain that had staved off the prying inquisition of another Justice.[4] It was a few months later in an interview at Chester that Lawrence Fogg of Hawarden, one of Robert Fogg's two conformist sons, made a desperate effort to win Philip Henry over to the Establishment : " wee reason'd long but neither hee proselyted [*sic*] to mee nor I to him."[5] It cannot be said that it was a very auspicious time for a Puritan conformist to win over a confirmed nonconformist. But the Chester interview very aptly reflected Lawrence Fogg's belief that the King and the Dissenters would not have their way for very long.

1 Nehemiah Lyde : *A Narrative of the Life of Mr. Richard Lyde of Hereford*.. (1731) (*O.R.*, iii, 547-548). The licence is recorded on p. 29 of the *Entry Book*.
2 Haycroft edn., pp. 94-95.
3 *S.P. 320*, 188.
4 *Ib.*, 205 (letter to an unnamed ' Reverend Sr ' dated 20 April, 1672).
5 *Diaries*, p. 254 (5 July).

(ii) The Nones of March.

The need for money to prosecute the war against the Protestants of Holland in the interests of the Catholics of France compelled Charles to re-assemble the Cavalier Parliament. On 3 February, 1672-1673, the licence *Entry Book* comes to a full stop on p. 289 (six licences for Wales were issued at this late hour); on the next day Parliament met; on the 6th Archbishop Sheldon, no doubt after a thorough sounding of prominent peers and commoners, felt emboldened to tell simple suffragans in the country that the King was truly sensible of the increase of sects and disorders, and was attributing this increase to the general neglect of instructing youths in the grounds and principles of true religion.[1] The real reason for the Primate's outburst was the pernicious Indulgence and the imminent probability of its destruction by Parliament; the real truth was that on the day before the letter was written Charles had (this was in an outburst of temper) told the Commons he was resolved 'to stick to my Declaration.'

But the same King, faced by the Commons' furious attack upon his dispensing power and by the deep suspicion aroused by his alliance with France, was forced on 7 March to break the Great Seal which gave a quasi-legal potency to the Declaration of 1672. It was a Friday, says Sir Joseph Williamson, a cold windy day in a cold windy season; nor does he disguise the fact that climate and politics between them made him also feel cold and melancholy.[2] Thus the Indulgence had lasted practically a year; '*a few months*,' says W. C. Abbott, a curiously contracted Americanism for a period extending from one March to another.[3] The Declaration of March had to go the same way as the Declaration of October (1660) and the Declaration of December (1662). Nevertheless, there is no doubt the King was genuinely sorry to break the Seal.

The glad news sped through the whole Anglican world, with immediately unpleasant results for some of the 1600 ministers who had been licenced in the preceding year. Before 20 March Puritan sermons at Wem and Drayton 'fell for

1 Cardwell: *Documentary Annals*, ii, 286-287.
2 *O.R.*, iii, 604.
3 *Col. Thos. Blood, Crown Stealer*, p. 85.

fear'.[1] Even before that the magistrates at Hereford (the mayor had the Welsh name of John Williams) were summoning the Presbyterian preacher George Primrose before them at the market-house,[2] while an indigent gentleman named 'Mr. H.' came with open mouth to Dr. Obadiah Grew of Coventry to charge him to desist from preaching, 'hoping to get [according to clause xi in the second Conventicle Act] a £100 from the Magistrates for neglecting their duty in not suppressing his Meeting.'[3] On 3 April Bishop Lucy writes to Sheldon that he hopes to proceed once more against defaulting Dissenters 'in our old method' of excommunication and fine.[4] In the course of the same month the Grand Jury of Montgomeryshire were 'presenting' eight nonconformists of the county for not repairing to their parish churches.[5] They were presented, be it noted, not only for failure to attend church during the bare month which had elapsed since the withdrawal of the Indulgence, but '*for not comeing to Church for a year last past.*' That is, the Montgomeryshire jurors made a bold attempt to go behind the King's Declaration and make their penalties retrospective. And that at a time when doubts ran deep whether the old penal laws had sprung automatically into force with the smashing of the Broad Seal; certainly at a juncture when no proclamation to that effect had emanated from the King and his Council.

(iii) A Bill of Ease.

The Hereford magistrates, the Montgomery jurors, the indigent gentleman, and the exulting Bishop were all of them far too eager and precipitate. For the nonce the Cavalier Parliament, having brought Charles to his knees on the constitutional issue, were more obsessed with the Papist danger than with the Nonconformist. There was no hurry to drive the cancellation of the Indulgence to its logical conclusion and revoke the licences: in fact, the mistaken theory postulated by Seaton for 1672 became tolerably true in 1673—'Churchman and Dissenter were

1 Philip Henry: *Diaries*, p. 262.
2 *O.R.*, iii, 547-548.
3 Calamy: *Contin.*, ii, 737. This particular clause in the Act of 1670 only allowed an informer the moiety of £50 of the £100 fine levied on dilatory J.P.'s (*Docts. Act Unif.*, ed. Gould, 496-497).
4 *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 40.
5 R. Williams: *Extracts from Gaol Files* (Mont. Colls., xxiv, 218-219). These nonconformists hailed from Llanwddyn, Llangurig, and Llanidloes.

temporarily at one in face of the common enemy.'[1] Before the end of March a Test Act was passed which banished Papists from the public services. About the same time (*mirabile dictu!*) the unhoped-for miracle was witnessed of a bill 'for the ease of Protestant Dissenters' passing through the House of Commons in all its stages, approved by the same people who had enacted the second Conventicle Act of 1670, and who had but a few weeks previously forced the King to break the Great Seal on the Indulgence.

"*Reports of Indulgence intended by y^e^ Parl., but not in the way as it now is.*"[2] So Philip Henry on 3 March, 1672-1673. These words must refer to the clauses of the 'bill of ease'—the new solution of the nonconformist problem—which were to operate as and from 25 March, 1673.[3] It was to continue in force for one whole year and thenceforward to the end of the next session of Parliament after the aforesaid one year. The teacher of a dissenting congregation had first to give personal notice of his desire for 'easement' to any two J.P.'s living near him, before them take the oaths of supremacy and obedience, make a declaration of his assent to all the xxxix articles of religion as incorporated in the Act of 1562, and subscribe another declaration of the unlawfulness of taking up arms against the King upon any pretence whatsoever. These taken and made, a declaration to that effect was issued by the two Justices. Exactly the same procedure—swearing the two oaths and making the two declarations—had to be observed in open court at the next general or quarter sessions of the county in which the minister lived. After that he was free to enjoy the liberty and freedom prescribed by the Act.

Very qualified indeed this new easement was. All doors and passages of such licenced houses were to be free and open; no such meeting-places were to be situated in any of the Universities of the Kingdom; nor were they to be contiguous to any public church or chapel, or within a hundred foot of the same. Dissenters were to be excused the duties of churchwardens, but were not exempted from the duty of finding substitutes and of paying them according to an

1 *Theory of Toleration*, p. 181.
2 *Diaries*, p. 261.
3 Those interested in this abortive bill of 1673 must turn over *Tanner MS.* 43, ff. 191-194.

agreement mutually agreed upon; and attacks upon the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England would mean the forfeiture of all advantages under the Act. After 1 May, 1673, the renunciation of the Covenant demanded by the Act of Uniformity was to cease: "we think it inconvenient," said the spokesman of the Commons in a broadening vista of dependent clauses, "to oblige any person who hath never taken the Covenant to inquire into it, which all those must necessarily do who are oblig'd to renounce it, whereby the memory of it will be continued which is fitt to be buried in Oblivion." This provision ante-dated the renunciation of the Covenant (more precisely, the maximum forward limit of such renunciation) by nine years, and was evidently designed to mollify the feelings of such members of the Presbyterian body as might be desirous of entering the Church of England. Clause xii of the Act of Uniformity had laid it down that such a renunciation was necessary up to 25 March, 1682.[1]

From this summary it will be seen that the Indulgence proposed by the Commons in 1673 was far more restricted than that of the King's in 1672, incorporating as it did some of the more obnoxious requirements of the Act of Uniformity and of the Five Mile Act; instead of the licence agents bringing the King's blessings to the very doors, the new bill was beset with a duplicate apparatus of formalities. And it would not be pleasant for Dissenters to know that the first draft of the bill asked licenced ministers to return to quarter sessions *a perfect list of the members of their congregations* in order to the more ready discovery of those gentlemen who never frequented *any* Protestant meeting-place; that those who had taken the Sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England within the space of one year before 25 March, 1673, and had suffered themselves to be seduced from that communion, were to lose all benefit from the Act; and that no minister was to have a licence in 1673 to preach in a parish in which he might have officiated from 1644 to 1660 (nor in any other parish within a distance of five miles therefrom)[2]. The first of these provisions was upon consideration left out altogether from the bill; the third was 'waved'

1 *Docts. Act Unif.*, ed. Gould, p. 394.
2 *Tanner MS.* 43, ff. 189-190v.

in Committee; the second cannot be discovered in the instrument that passed the Commons. It might be said that the original draftsmen meant it to be a bill for the strengthening of the Anglican interest rather than for the ease of Dissenters.

(iv) Respite.

Sad to say, the Bill of Ease (such as it was) never became an Act. It was wrecked in the Lords through the influence of the same Sheldon who had so successfully opposed the mitigation of the Act of Uniformity at the end of August 1662.[1] The wrecking was accomplished in a brilliantly subtle manner—by suggesting such amendments to the bill as would base the easement upon a proclamation of the King under the Great Seal and so assimilate the new Indulgence with the old. This had the well-calculated effect of rousing to fever heat the temper of the Commons. The Lords affected to say they would be satisfied with 'only his Majesties Licence'; in other words, oaths and declarations before J.P.'s were unnecessary, certificates from the Clerk of the Peace of no useful purport. Thus hypocritically argued Sheldon and the bench of bishops.[2] It drew from the Commons the rejoinder that these tests would declare the differences between Popish and Protestant dissenters, differences 'which were never sufficiently distinguisht by any Law yet extant,' and they did not forget to add that such a disclosure would conduce considerably to the preservation and security of the Protestant religion.

This ultra-Protestant outlook of the Commons saved for a time the old licences from extinction. On the 24th March Philip Henry wrote in his diary that if trouble should come for 'what wee doe now in the use of present liberty' (this must mean the continuing liberty after the cancellation of the Great Seal on the 7th), he was heroically determined neither to shrink from it nor sink under it.[3] Eleven days later a letter arrived from London (written in all probability by his friend Steele) which said licencees were not to take notice of any question or interference, but to plead their licences until they were officially revoked; the same letter

1 *Docts. Act Unif.*, ed. Gould, pp. 407-408; see also Calamy: *Contin.*, i, 9-11.

2 How well the bishops agreed with the Archbishop's arguments can be seen from the letters sent him at this juncture by the Bishops of Winchester and Exeter (*Tanner MS.* 42, ff. 7, 137).

3 p. 259.

gave Henry a pretty neat summary of the proposed Bill of Ease—'wee should have liberty to preach, at least for a year & if y^e^ Quarter-sessions grant it.'[1] At the end of April he saw at Whitchurch another missive from the capital breaking the good news that the King and Council were sending orders to all J.P.'s to 'forbear disturbing,' that is, they were not to apply the pre-Indulgence penal laws without notice to that purpose duly given.[2] Another mollifying injunction was sent out on the 13 June.[3] This time of truce was one of exceptional difficulty to J.P.'s, what with the Council's desire for non-interference, what with the desire of informers to fill their pockets once more with 'inertia' fines.[4] The *State Papers* for 1673 (and to some extent for 1674) disclose many petitions to London for light and leading. The answers given, notwithstanding their studied euphuism, show that the love of the Council towards Dissenters had not quite abated.

For all the injunctions, many ardent Anglican J.P.'s *did* boldly enter into conventicles (even though some of the preachers could show the King's licences), levy fines upon the frequenters, and take distresses. Repeatedly did the Council order the sheriffs to discharge the conventicle men of the King's "thirds" (that is, the proportion of the fines to which the King was entitled under Clause ii of the Conventicle Act of 1670). The other two-thirds were to be applied as usual by the sheriff as the Act provided.[5] It was by thus playing with fractions the King hoped to delay the demise of the Indulgence.

Parallel with this fractional favour of the King and Council was the sanguine belief of many good men that the licences of 1672 had not been affected by the breaking of the Seal, that they were unqualified, and that no time-limit was stated beyond which they needed renewal. Professor Lyon Turner says these points were arguable in a court of law,[6] and it is a fact that at this very period of uncertainty the well-organised

1 pp. 262-263 (4 April).
2 p. 263 (24 April).
3 *C.S.P.*, 1673, pp. 367-368.
4 For a very piquant situation at the town of Cambridge in 1674, see *Camb. Antiq. Soc. Communics.*, xvii, 94.
5 *Calendar of Treasury Books*, iv (1672-1675), pp. 188, 191 and passim (esp. p. 630). It is necessary to say that many of these conventiclers had no sort of a licence to show.
6 *O.R.*, iii, 57.

Dissenters of Bristol had appointed eight delegates (two from each congregation) whose business it was 'to advize, consider and manage Matters of our generall concerne . . . in their legall defence.'[1] Yet on the general issue it must be admitted that, if the Commons had fulfilled Brand's prophecy by destroying the validity of the Declaration as opposed to an Act of Parliament,[2] and had expressed in the Bill of Ease what differences from the old licences were to be expected in the new, no judge would go very far in upholding the old. All depended on how long the temper of King, Council and Commons would continue.

In the meantime the Gouge movement in Wales, protected in its early days by the shield of the Declaration, developed apace, and saw its most successful days in the period that lay between the breaking of the Seal and the final revocation of the licences.[3]

(v) Revocation.

In some vital respects, the key to the position was held by Shaftesbury, that same Shaftesbury who had been at the elbow of the King in drafting the Declaration of 1672 and who seemingly had done so little for its practical working. By the beginning of 1673 that statesman had more accurately divined the inner policy of Charles, hitherto so carefully locked up in the bosoms of Clifford and Arlington: he swung round to demand the withdrawal of the Indulgence, and became one of the most violent supporters of the Test Act. For thus deserting the King's policy he had to surrender the seals in November.

A very few months after that Buckingham and Arlington were standing at the bar of the Commons to explain why they had given their support to the 1672 'Declaration of Liberty.' Both boldly admitted the support, but 'no farther only than what might be done by the Declaration by law.' In other words, they tactfully denounced the King's dispensing power (although there were good grounds for the rumour that Buckingham had advised the King to bring the army to town and take out of both Houses those members who insisted on

1 *Broadmead Records* (Haycroft edn.), p. 95.
2 *Supra*, p. 241.
3 Dr. Thos. Rees: *Hist. Prot. Noncon.*, pp. 204-205 (references to years 1673-1674, 1674-1675).

destroying the Declaration).[1] Before 1674 was far advanced the more prominent members of the Cabal were either dead or dismissed, and the Earl of Danby was the King's chief minister. This meant that the Romanising projects of Charles had been abandoned. He reverted to the counsels of his estranged Anglican friends and gave ready ear to the persecution of Dissenters—men who were no longer of any use to him. The Commons at once accommodated themselves to this new orientation. There was no further talk of ease to nonconformists. On 3 February, 1674-1675, two years to the day since the last licence was issued, Archbishop Sheldon was able to carry his point in Council that the licences be officially revoked and declared to be of no validity[2]; even then it was not done by an order *ad hoc*, but in 'y^e^ latter end' of a proclamation against the Papists.[3] The situation had changed somewhat from that of two years before when there was a 'Procl. agt Papists, but wee not mention'd.'[4] The historian Calamy says Baxter was the very first to be apprehended 'after the Alteration of affairs'[5]; if so, he was very closely followed on the 10 February by a prominent Bristol minister who was sent to prison for six months for preaching.[6] A little later, Bunyan was taken to gaol once more at Bedford—'driven from you in presence, [but] not in affection.'[7] The first Indulgence was dead.

Worse than that, carefully preserved in the archives of the State was the *Entry Book 38A* with the names and likely whereabouts of 4,173 ministers and Puritan householders. The new persecution could begin work with excellent information at its disposal. David Maurice of Penybont was not long before bringing John Kynaston of Bryngwyn in charge for giving harbour to a minister friend of Philip Henry.[8] After this proclamation and during the little time left to him in this world Bishop William Lucy would be at full liberty

1 Cobbett: *Complete Colln. of State Trials*, vi, 1049, 1058, 1061; for the rumour, 1044, n. †.

2 The '1676' of *O.R.*, iii, 607, must be a slip. iii, 39 has the correct date. Neal's *History of the Puritans* (ed. Toulmin, 1796) vol. iv, 545, refers to revocation, but gives no exact date.

3 *Broadmead Recs.*, (Haycroft edn.), p. 96.

4 Philip Henry: *Diaries*, p. 262 (under 20 March, 1672-1673).

5 *Abridgement*, i, 341-342.

6 *Broadmead Recs.*, (Haycroft edn.), p. 97.

7 Dr. John Brown: *Life*, p. 254.

8 *Diaries*, p. 274. During this spring and summer of 1675 Maurice's activities as a persecutor seem to have exceeded all bounds. There is sound evidence that he found himself temporarily put out of the Commission of the Peace for Montgomeryshir (*Calendar of Wynn Papers*, No. 2727).

to snap Dissenters with a *de excomm. cap.* without giving painful posers to Sheldon as to whether that writ 'exceeded' a licence and without any perplexing doubts as to what the King would say. The American Abbott says the old persecuting rigour never revived after 1672-1673[1]: let him read Philip Henry's account of the distraint upon his goods in 1681,[2] peruse the Margam warrant of 1684 in search of Samuel Jones and Stephen Hughes,[3] and learn Welsh in order to read the tragic couplets of Richard Pugh of Tredwstan in 1687.[4] And were not the latter stages of the new attack upon nonconformists barbed and pointed by the prostituted genius of George Jeffreys of Acton, the Welsh Chief Justice and Lord Chancellor?

But Jeffreys died in the Tower. The first Indulgence was not the last. Just a year after the third Declaration was issued by James II the Toleration Act was passed.

NOTE: A SURVIVING LICENCE.

The numerous references in the footnotes to the *Diaries* of Philip Henry are good evidence that he is the outstanding authority for Wales (and for England, too, in many respects) both for the nonconformist attitude towards the Declaration and for the workaday application of the Indulgence. It just happens also that his is the only Welsh licence that has been preserved. In 1882 it was in the possession of one of his descendants, Mr. E. M. Williams of Hale Cliff, Liverpool (*Diaries*, p. 251, footnote).

1 *Col. Thos. Blood, Crown Stealer*, p. 85.
2 *Diaries*, pp. 307, 308.
3 *Trans. Welsh Bapt. Hist. Soc.* (1916-1919), p. 57.
4 Joshua Thomas: *Hanes*, pp. 42-44.

INDEX OF PERSONS, &c.

A

Alleine, Joseph, 43, 179.
Alward, Lewis, 158, 230, 232.
Andrews, William, 158.
Anglesey, Earl of, 54.
Appetitus caninus, 32.
Arlington, Earl of, 54, 59, 68, 75, 77, 240, 248.

B

Baker, Thomas, 125, 163, 164 (wife).
Bampfield, Francis, 55, 88, 110, 218.
Banks, Sir John, 111.
Barber, William, 20.
Barnes, Thomas, 43, 98, 160, 161, 207.
Bassett, Thomas, 2.
Baxter, Richard, 5, 15, 65, 88, 106, 249.
Beales, John, 41.
Beard, John, 31.
Bennett, William, 149.
Benson, Francis, 75, 86, 101, 187.
Bevan, Richard, 158.
Birch, Col. Thomas, 92.
Bishop, Abel, 40.
Blethin, William, 21, 230.
Blinman [Blindman], Richard, 43 (n. 1).
Blood, Col. Thomas, 33 (n. 2), 63-64, 111, 112, 113, 219.
Bodvel, Col. John, 54, 134, 152-153.
———, Sarah, 54, 152-153.
Brand, Thomas, 241, 248.
Brickdall (Brigdale), William, 27, 28.
Bridgeman, Dr. Henry, 23.
———, Sir Orlando, 53.
Bridgewater, Earl of, 54.
Brown(e), John, 163-164.
Bryan, Dr. John, 111.
Brydall, John, 52.
Bunyan, John, 84 (n. 2), 110-111, 126, 195-196, 249.
Bushell's Case, 53.
Butler, Dr. Nicholas, 63-64, 73, 89, 90, 91, 100-101, 111-112, 217, 218.

C

Calamy, Edmund (the Elder), 65.
———, ———, (the Second), 85, 101, 227.
———, ———, (the Third), 4, 25, 32, 65, 185.
Carr, Sir Robert, 52.
Carter, Col. John, 12.
Chauncey, Ichabod, 183.
———, Isaac, 183.
Christopher, Eve, 158.
———, Jacob, 158, 230.
Clarkson, David, 182, 241.
Clifford, Lord, 54-55, 75, 101, 110.
Coleman, Henry, 36.
Collier, Thomas, 188.
Coore, Richard, 88.
Cornish, Dr. Henry, 85.
Cox, John, 125.
Cradock, Walter, 1, 4, 14, 46-47, 106, 232.
———, Richard, 228, 231.
———, Watkin, 158, 231.
Craven, Lord, 111.

D

Dafydd, Edward, 4, 197.
Davies (David), David, 6, 31.
———, Edward, 19.
———, Ellis, 149, 150.
———, Evan, 156.
———, Francis (Archdeacon), 34, 192.
———, James, 82, 98, 104, 155, 156, 172, 186-187.
———, John, 15.
———, Mytton, 185.
———, Owen, 104-105.
Davies, Philip, 156, 223.
———, Richard, 41.
———, Thomas, 8.
———, Thomas (Llanarmon, Eif.), 139 (n. 2).
Dawkins, Rowland, 20.
Dawson, Joseph, 55.
De la Cloche, James, 56.
Denne, Henry, 66.
Dent, Henry, 74 (nn. 4, 5).
Dykes, William, 158, 228.

E

Eaton, Robert, 227.
Edwards, Charles, 34, 115, 118-119, 194.
———, Hugh (Llangadog), 177.
———, Hugh (Oswestry), 163, 164-165.
———, John, 37, 98, 159, 160, 198.
———, Richard (Llanfair D.C.), 194.
———, Richard (Nanhoron), 27, 135, 136, 234.
Ellis, Dr. John, 4.
———, Thomas, 119.
Elston, Elizabeth, 146.
Erbery, Dorcas, 166.
———, William, 6, 137, 166, 232.
Evans, Hugh (Llanhir), 209-210.
———, Hugh (Merioneth), 210 (n. 5).
———, Hugh (Pwllheli), 130, 131.
———, John, 34, 51, 105, 146-147, 164, 174, 227, 232.
———, Morgan, 45.
———, Richard, 22.
———, Robert, 19.
———, Stephen, 163.
———, Thomas, 98, 108 (n. 1), 154, 155, 212-213.
Ewins, Thomas, 43.
Exeter, Countess of, 54 (n. 4), 62, 102.
Eyton, Owen, 13.

F

Field, Playfair, 22.
Fincher, William, 82.
Flower, Benjamin, 165, 166-167, 218.
Fogg, Laurence, 14, 241.
———, Robert, 14, 163, 165, 236.
———, Roland, 14.
Foreman, William, 20.
Fox, George, 41, 211.
Francis, Abel, 214 (n. 2).
Franklin, Jenkin, 157.
———, Joshua, 156.
Freeman, Thomas, 26.
French, John, 98, 158, 191.

G

Gates, Thomas, 83-84.
Gethin, Robert, 158.
Gibbon, Mark, 79, 161, 190.
Gifford, Andrew, 195.
Gilbert, Thomas, 126.
Gilson, Thomas, 78, 112 (and n. 4).
Glyn(ne), Edward, 17.
———, Hugh, 153.
Goodwin, Richard, 125.
———, Dr. Thomas, 34, 64.
Gouge, Thomas, 175-179, 248.
Gough, Dorothy, 163, 165 (and n. 2).
Greene, William, 162, 212.
Gregory, Henry, 213, 214.
———, Peter, 213.
Grew, Dr. Obadiah, 243.
Griffith, Alexander, 4, 5, 6, 11, 23, 48, 201, 237.
Griffith, Elizabeth, 163, 165.
———, Frederic, 134.
———, Dr. George, 6.
———, George, 64, 165, 168. 179, 217-218.
———, Henry, 158.
———, John (Llanddyfnan), 3.
———, John (Llangwnadl), 135.
———, Morris (Maurice), Beguildy, 162, 189.
———, Morris, (Maurice), Bodferyn, 133 (n. 1), 134-135.
———, Richard, 162, 189.
———, William (Cefn Amwlch), 17.
———, William (Pwllheli), 130, 136.
Gwyn, Widow, 155.

H

H., Mr., 243.
Hall, Edmund, 17.
———, John, 125-126.
Halton, Archdeacon Timothy, 123-124, 224.
Hanmer, John, 130, 162, 235.
———, Joseph, 240.
Hardcastle, Thomas, 195.
Hartley, John, 207.
Henry, Philip, 8, 15, 18, 23, 30, 32-33, 53, 62, 87, 91, 98, 102, 110, 113, 114, 121, 124-125, 132, 149, 180, 192-194, 216, 226-227, 241, 244, 246-247, 250.
Heywood, Nathaniel, 27 (n. 1).
———, Oliver, 67 (and n. 5), 110, 113, 126.
Hickes, John, 62, 84-85, 101, 112, 218.
Higgs, Daniel, 82, 92, 98, 103, 132, 158, 225.
Holles, Lord, 54, 111.
Hollister, Nicholas, 19.
Holmes, Thomas, 41, 137, 211.
Hopden, Elizabeth, 107.
Howell, Griffith, 40.
———, Morgan, 156, 236.
———, William, 160.
Hughes, David, 155.
———, Evan, 98, 155, 183.
———, John (Glimmin), 146.
———, John (Wrexham), 121, 125, 146, 147.
Hughes, Stephen, 4, 38, 82, 98, 99, 102-103, 114, 123, 157, 158, 170, 176-177, 235, 250.

I

Innes, James, senr., 63-64, 101.
Innes, James, junr., 101, 104, 167, 190.
Ives, Jeremiah, 5, 165, 168, 209, 210.

J

Jacomb, Dr. Thomas, 54, 182 (n. 1).
Jackson, James, 149.
James, John (Bleddfa), 139-140.
———, John (Cenarth), 156.
———, Thomas, 160.
Jenkins, Widow, 103, 157.
———, Matthew, 26.
Jenkinson, Capt., 18.
Jenkyn, William, 78 (n. 1).
Jessey, Henry, 6, 39.
Jones, Barzillai, 208.
———, Cadwaladr, 136.
———, David (Llanddewibrefi), 115, 156.
———, David, (Pencarreg), 86, 98, 115, 116, 120, 183.
———, Edward, 138.
———, Evan, 24-25.
———, Henry, 128.
———, Capt. Jenkin, 8. 16, 37, 38, 98, 104, 141, 161, 205-206, 208, 222.
———, Joan, 159, 231.
———, Col. John, 8, 151, 232.
———, John (Aberystruth), 159.
———, John (Llwynrhys), 156.
———, John (Wilcrick), 44.
———, Margaret, 159.
———, Morris, 136; widow of, 130, 131.
———, Nathaniel, 233.
Jones, Col. Philip, 11, 233.
———, Rice (Carmarthen), 171 (n. 3).
———, Rice (Llanfair, Mont.), 9.
———, Richard (Abergavenny), 37.
———, Richard (Ruabon), 79, 115, 120.
———, Roger, 13.
———, Samuel, 4, 26, 34, 37, 43, 81, 98, 104, 158, 159, 173-174, 177, 178, 191-192, 194, 250.
———, Thomas (Bedwellty), 159, 160
———, Thomas (Castell), 4.
———, Thomas (Eglwysilan), 158, 200-201.
———, Thomas (Milton), 44.
———, Walter, 160.
———, Watkin, 42, 160, 189-190.
———, William (licence agent), 105-106, 107, 116, 117, 118.
———, William (Eglwysilan), 158, 200-201.
———, William (Plas Têg), 76, 77, 98, 105, 108, 194, 223.
———, William (Rhydwilym), 38, 105-106.
———, William (Usk), 106.
Joseph, Thomas, 98, 158.
Juice, Thomas, 168.

K

Keach, Benjamin, 218.
Keeling, Francis, 125
Kenrick, Edward, 92, 146.
Keys, Catherine, 149.
King, Ann, 129, 130, 139, 162.
———, Edward, 126, 163.
———, John, 163.
King, Lawrence, 218.
———, Richard, 230.
Knollys, Hanserd, 5, 218.
Kyffin, William, 65, 106, 218, 220.
Kynaston, John, 129, 130, 139, 151, 234, 249.
———, Roger, 146, 234.

L

Lamb, Thomas, 209, 210.
Lauderdale, Earl of, 55, 63.
Lawrence, John, 125.
Lewis, Ambrose, 174-175.
———, James, 159, 189.
———, John, 4, 5, 15 (n. 3), 223.
———, Simon, 201.
———, William, 52.
Lloyd, Charles (Bleddfa), 139-140.
———, Charles (Dolobran), 140.
———, Charles (Gwernyfed), 130, 138, 234.
———, David, 117.
———, Evan, 139.
———, Bp. Hugh, 24 (n. 1).
———, Bp. Humphrey, 175-176.
Lloyd, Jenkin, 13, 14.
———, Joshua, 83, 115, 117-118, 120, 231.
———, Luke, 149, 230.
———, Mary, 149, 151.
———, Bp. William, 34, 141, 146.
———, William (St. Petrox), 177.
Llwyd, Morgan, 6, 7-8, 9, 14, 117, 132, 146, 147, 231, 232.
Love, Christopher, 3, 180.
Lucas, John, 183.
Lucy, Bp. William, 31, 82, 88, 95-97, 141, 169, 177, 226, 249-250.
Ludlow, Edmund, 234.
Lyde, Nehemiah, 104.

M

Madryn, Thomas, 17.
Mathew, William, 20.
Matthews, Marmaduke, 98, 101-102, 115, 158, 192, 235.
Maurice, David, 97, 249, (and n. 8).
———, Griffith, 134.
———, Henry, 26, 39, 116, 126-127, 129-142, 163, 172, 226, 236; wife of, 135; sister of, 130, 135.
———, John, 160, 200.
Maylor (Meyler), Richard, 161, 231, 233.
Miles, John, 7, 17, 21, 23, 36-37, 38.
Miller, Joshua, 7, 98, 158, 192, 235.
Mills, Richard, 162.
Milman, William, 88, 159, 160, 172, 199, 231.
Milward, George, 86.
———, John, 86.
Monck, George (Duke of Albemarle) 10, 53, 181.
Monck, Dr. Nicholas, 142 (n. 3).
Moon, John, 211, 213.
Moore, Richard, 83.
Morgan, Elizabeth, 158.
———, George, 160, 232-233.
———, John, 156.
———, Llewellyn, 158, 159, 232.
———, Owen, 162, 189.
———, Reginald, 98, 122, 159, 189.
———, Bp. Robert, 28, 129, 130, 138.
———, Robert, 156.
———, William, 46.
Morris, Evan, 103, 157.
———, Henry, 172 (n. 1).
———, John, 92, 159.
———, Owen, 18.
Mort livings, 23 (and n. 1).
Musgrave, John, 85.
Myddelton, Sir Thomas, 11.

N

Nevett, Rowland, 51, 99, 163, 164.
Nicholls, Henry, 6.

O

Oasland, Henry, 126.
Oddy, Joseph, 125-126.
Okey, John, 125.
Oxford Oath, The, 31, 181-182.
Owen, Edward, 162.
———, Ellis, 190.
———, Hugh, 82, 105, 130, 149, 150, 225, 236.
Owen, James, 141, 146, 150, 173.
———, Dr. John, 4, 33, 64, 66, 150, 168, 217-218, 220.
———, John, 149, 150-151.
———, Richard, 138.
———, William, 105.

P

Papists, 57-59, 65-67, 91.
Parker, Alexander, 211.
Parrot, Mr., 221.
Parry, Ellis, 134.
— —, Jeffrey, 17.
———, William, 20 (n. 3).
Phillips, Daniel, 135.
———, John, 79, 161, 190.
———, Peregrine, 40, 95, 98, 104, 161-162, 172, 190, 231.
Picton, James, 31, 99, 171-172.
Player, Sir Thomas, 110.
Pledger, Elias, 86.
Plume, Robert, 120.
Powell, John, 42, 92, 98, 115, 116-117, 120.
———, Rees, 158, 234.
———, Rice, 156, 236.
Powell, Richard, 14, 203.
———, Vavasor, 1, 6, 7, 8, 12, 16, 30, 33, 47-48, 51, 58-59, 89, 127, 132, 168, 179, 189, 197, 223, 232.
Price, Charles, 165, 167.
———, Christopher, 159, 198, 220, 233.
———, Peter, 211.
———, Dr. Richard, 26-27.
———, Richard, 151, 230.
———, Thomas, 162, 222.
Prichard, Humphrey, 27-28.
———, John, 146.
———, William, 37-38, 160, 228.
Prosser, Walter, 42.
Protheroe, Rice, 172, 223.
Prytherch, Lewis, 122, 154, 222.
Pugh, John, 148.
———, Richard, 34, 250.

Q

Quarrell, James, 92, 163, 164.
———, Thomas, 42, 160, 199-200, 227, 230-231.
Queries upon the Declaration, 216-217.

R

Rees, David, 156.
———, Howell, 158, 233-234.
———, Lewis, 158.
Reyner, Edward, 186.
Reynolds, Jane, 160.
Richard(s), William, 159, 199, 231.
Rider, William, 6.
Robartes, Lord, 54, 68, 152-153, 234.
———, Robert, 54, 152-153, 234.
Roberts, Evan, 223.
———, Griffith, 133 (n. 2).
———, Hugh, 121.
———, Humphrey, 136.
———, John, 146.
———, Jonathan, 98, 105, 146, 174.
———, Dr. Michael, 119, 146, 151, 177.
Roberts, Bp. William, 133, 177.
Robinson, George, 98, 160, 235.
———, Hugh, 28.
Rogers, David, 151-152.
———, Hugh, 98, 151-152, 190.
———, John, 1, 9, 220-221.
———, Nathan, 44.
———, Philip, 146.
Rosser, Llewellyn, 159.
Roughead, Josias, 126.
Rowlands, Ellis, 98, 144, 174, 190; wife of, 174.
———, John, 131, 144-145, 235.
———, William (Llanfabon), 158.
———, William (Llangybi), 131, 144, 145.

S

Salkeld, John, 126.
Sankey, Widow, 127, 129, 163.
Saunders, Richard, 86.
Savage, John, 85.
Seale, George, 165, 167.
Shaftesbury, Earl of, 55, 60-61, 68, 248.
Shearman, Edward, 191.
Sheldon, Archbp. Gilbert, 10, 15, 18. 50-51, 169, 239-240, 242, 246, 249.
Smith, Thomas, 78.
Smith, William, 22.
Snowe, Ralph, 67.
Spicer, Capt., 18.
Steele, Richard, 62, 102, 110, 114, 149 165, 246.
Strena Vavasoriensis, 5.
Swaine, Richard, 163, 164.
Symonds, Edmund, 126, 163.
———, Richard, 232.

T

Terrill, Edward, 141.
Thirds, 247.
Thomas, David (Llandisiliogogo), 156.
———, David, (Wimblimglym), 79, 146.
———, Edmund, 11-12, 234.
———, Evan, 21.
———, Howell, 98, 158.
———, Lewis, 45, 158, 227, 228.
———, Morgan, 158, 235.
———, Richard, 131.
———, Robert, 37, 80, 158, 159, 225, 235.
Thomas, Timothy, 163, 164.
———, Bp. William, 99.
———, William (Llantrisant, Mon.), 39, 42, 43, 45, 197-198.
———, William, (Swansea) 172.
Tombes, John, 6, 195, 218.
Tonman, Thomas, 162, 204, 222.
Trapnell, Anna, 6.
Trevor, Sir John, 75-77.
Twisleton, Col. George, 12, 232.

V

Vaughan, John (Lord Justice), 53.
Veal, Edward, 188.

W

Walker, Henry, 21.
Walter, Henry, 16-17, 98, 106, 159, 235.
Waters, Edward, 159, 199, 231.
Watkin(s), George, 19.
———, John, 160.
———, Morgan, 7, 211.
———, Thomas, 38, 202, 228.
———, William (Llanigon), 130, 137, 154, 201-202, 233, 235; his wife, 202.
———, William (Talgarth), 122, 123, 154.
Weaver, John, 98, 162, 170, 186, 188.
Williams, Barbara, 160, 237-238.
———, Widow, 158.
———, Dr. Daniel, 121.
———, Daniel, 120-121, 188.
———, David (Peniarth), 149.
———, David (Talgarth), 122, 123, 154.
———, Ellis, 144, 190.
———, Evan, 160, 233.
———, Dr. Griffith, 27-28.

Williams, Henry (Marshfield), 230.
———, Henry (Merthyr), 37, 158, 233.
———, Henry (Ysgafell), 203.
———, Archbishop John, 28.
———, John (Devynnock), 13-14.
———, John (Hereford), 243.
———, John (Ty'nycoed), 98, 130, 131, 133-134, 144, 145-146, 236.
———, Lowry, 135.
———, Rice, 230, 237-238.
———, Thomas, 92-93, 104-105.
———, Walter, 159, 199, 231.
Williamson, Sir Joseph, 64, 75, 111, 124, 183, 242.
Willis, Samuel, 81.
Wilson, Reginald, 174.
Woodward, William, 241.
Wroth, William, 1, 43 (n. 1), 46, 235.
Wynn(e), Dr. Edward, 139 (n. 2).
———, Owen, 28 (and n. 1).
———, Rice, 23.
———, Thomas, 134.
———, William, 146, 147-148, 230.

Y

Yates, Thomas, 125.

INDEX OF PLACES.

A

Aberdaron, 134.
Abergavenny, 3, 6, 26, 37, 46, 98, 159, 160, 195.
Abergele, 3, 79.
Aberhafesb, 174.
Aberystruth, 45, 159.
Andrew's, St. (Glam.), 7, 98, 158.
Anglesey, 143-144.

B

Baglan, 37, 80, 158, 159, 235.
Bala, 146.
Bangor-on-Dee, 14, 163, 165.
Bassaleg, 19.
Bath, 179.
Bedford, 110, 195, 249.
Bedwas, 42.
Bedwellty, 45, 159, 160, 231.
Beguildy, 89, 162, 189, 204.
Bettws (Glam.), 37.
Bettws (Mon.), 98, 122, 159, 189, 229.
Bettws y Crwyn, 163.
Bettws Diserth, 98, 170, 222.
Bewdley, 195.
Birmingham, 81, 82.
Bishopston, 103, 158.
Blaencanaid, 31.
Bleddfa, 139-140.
Bodferyn, 133 (n. 1).
Boduan, 134, 135.
Bodvel House, 54, 131, 144, 145, 152-153, 234.
Bodwenni, 149, 150.
Bolas, 163.
Bolton, 125.
Bottwnog, 133, 172,
Brecknock, 45, 124.
Brecon, 97, 141, 143, 170, 172, 210.
Bride's St. (Glam.), 158.
Bride's St. (Mon.), 44, 231.
Bridgend, 6, 98, 158.
Bridgnorth, 164.
Bristol, 42-43, 98, 185, 195, 213, 241, 247-248.
Broad Oak, 31, 98, 102, 124, 149.
Bromfield (by Ludlow), 26, 133 (n. 1).
Bronyelydwr, 130.
Bryn (Flint), 124, 149.
Bryngwyn, 129, 130, 151, 234, 249.
Brynllywarch, 173-174, 178.
Bryn-y-ffynnon, 147.
Bury St. Edmunds, 180, 182.

C

Caerhun, 138.
Caerleon, 98, 159.
Caernarvon (town), 98, 144, 190.
Caerwent, 92, 159.
Caldicot, 19, 21, 159, 189, 233.
Cambridge (co.), 83.
Cambridge (town), 126, 247 (n. 4).
Canterbury, 115.
Cardiff, 12, 98, 158, 165, 166, 191, 208.
Cardigan, (co.), 3.
Cardigan (town), 98, 104, 155, 170, 172.
Carmarthen (town), 16, 31, 38, 99, 123, 170, 171.
Cascob, 139.
Castell Caereinion, 4, 23, 212.
Castle Combe, 166.
Cefn Carneddau, 234.
Cellan, 98, 155.
Cenarth, 82, 156.
Chester, 241.
Chetton, 22.
Chippenham, 165, 167.
Chirk, 11.
Christchurch (Mon.), 159, 231.
Church Stretton, 26, 126, 134, 163, 164.
Cildeudy, 158.
Cilfowyr, 205.
Cilfwnwr, 37, 182.
Cilgerran, 38, 98, 104, 161, 205-206.
Clodock, 43.
Clynnog, 18, 98, 144.
Clyro, 163, 164.
Conway, 27.
Coventry, 111, 210.
Cowbridge, 59, 158.
Craig-yr-allt, 200.
Cristionydd, 146, 147.
Cydewain, 10.
Cynfal, 131, 149.

D

Daventry, 120.
Denbigh (town), 76, 98, 115.
Devynnock, 13.
Deytheur, 97.
Dihewid, 80, 156, 223.
Dinham, 21.
Dolgelley, 4, 119.
Dorchester, 110, 113-114.
Dover, 218.
Drayton, 125, 240, 242.
Dredgmanhill, 162.
Dublin, 121.

E

Eglwysilan, 37, 116, 158, 200, 231.
Ellington, 83-84.
Erwgoyel, 149, 150-151.

F

Fagans, St., 41.
Farincomb, 86.
Forden, 163.
Freystrop, 161.

G

Gelligaer, 158.
Gladestry, 139.
Glasbury, 14, 23, 203.
Glasgwm, 89, 130, 162, 167, 204, 222.
Glimmin, 146.
Glynceiriog, 148-149.
Glyncorrwg, 98, 158.
Godmanchester, 84.
Goitrehen, 37, 98, 104, 158, 234.
Guilsfield, 52.
Gunley, 130, 151.
Gwernyfed, 130, 133, 138, 234.
Gwyddelen (by Llangwnadl), 135.
Gwynfryn (by Pwllheli), 130, 135.
Gyffin, 27.

H

Halifax, 67, 113, 126.
Hanmer, 59, 102, 124, 149, 165.
Haverfordwest, 95, 98, 104, 161, 170, 172, 190, 231.
Hawarden, 14.
Hay, The, 6, 11.
Hencsant, 117, 118.
Henllys (Mon.), 159.
Hereford, 15, 243.
Hexham, 219.
Holyhead, 2, 12.

I

Ilston, 17, 229.

K

Kenfig, 33, 158, 230.
Kensfroid, 146.
Kerry, 10.
Kildwick, 207.
Kingsbridge, 62.
Kington, 6.
Kinmel, 12.
Knighton, 7, 47, 211.

L

Leeds, 55.
Leicester, 84 (n. 2), 126.
Lewes, 112.
Lismore, 208.
London (in general), 2-3, 8, 9, 192.
———, particular districts and places—
———, Addle Street, 64, 165.
———, Aldersgate Street, 78 (n. 1).
———, Axe Yard, W'ster, 64.
———, Bartholomew's Close, 62, 102, 103.
———, Bel Alley, 209.
———, Blackfriars, 7.
———, Blue Anchor Alley, 51.
———, Charterhouse Yard, 64, 220.
———, Cherry Tree Alley, 47, 85.
London, Curriers' Hall, St. Alphege, 101, 227.
———, Finsbury Court, Moorfields, 64-65.
———, Hackney, 182.
———, Hammersmith, 165, 167.
———, King's Head Tavern, by Somerset Ho., 104.
———, Little Britain, 62.
———, London Bridge, 85.
———, Old Jewry, 209.
———, Tyburn, 63.
———, Wapping, 188.
———, Westmoreland House, 62, 102, 165.
Ludlow, 135.
Lythans, St., 98, 116.

Ll

Llanaelhaiarn, 136.
Llanafanfawr, 98, 108 (n. 1), 154, 212.
Llanarmon, Eifionydd, 131, 132, 134.
Llanbadarn (Cards.), 3, 8, 98, 115, 172, 223.
Llanbadarn Odwyn, 156.
Llanbeblig, 17.
Llanbedr y Cenin, 27.
Llanbedr Pont Stephan, 116, 156.
Llanbedrog, 24-25.
Llanbister, 129, 130, 162, 235.
Llanbrynmair, 39, 97, 130.
Llanddeiniolen, 105.
Llanddewibrefi, 116, 156.
Llanddewi Ystradenny, 34, 213.
Llandefaelog (Breck.), 155.
Llandegai, 138.
Llandinam, 3.
Llandisilio, 115.
Llandisiliogogo, 156.
Llandrindod, 162, 212.
Llandyfriog, 98, 155.
Llanedern, 42.
Llanegryn, 105, 149, 225.
Llanerfyl, 13.
Llanfabon, 158.
Llanfaches, 1, 6, 39, 44, 117, 197, 229.
Llanfair Caereinion, 9.
—— Dyffryn Clwyd, 27, 98, 146, 174.
—— Trelygen, 156.
Llanfechain, 147, 234.
Llanfeugian, 122, 123, 154, 222, 231.
Llanfihangel Bryn Pabuan, 33.
—— Nant Melan, 162, 204, 222.
—— y Pennant, 151.
—— Roggiett, 21.
—— Ystern Llewern, 41.
Llanfyllin, 47, 138, 147, 227.
Llangammarch, 140.
Llangattock (Breck.), 15, 24.
Llangattock (Mon.), 98, 160.
Llangeinor, 98, 158.
Llangenith, 157.
Llangennech, 156, 157, 228.
Llangewydd, 158-159.
Llangian, 98, 145.
Llangibby, 159, 231.
Llangoedmor, 13.
Llangollen, 33.
Llangolman, 95.
Llangorse, 98, 159.
Llangunllo (Rad.), 162.
Llangurig, 1, 243 (n. 5).
Llangwm (Mon.), 42, 88, 159, 199, 231.
Llangwm (Pemb.), 40, 98, 161, 229.
Llangwnadl, 17.
Llangybi, Eifionydd, 136, 139, 141, 144, 190.
Llangyfelach, 11, 80.
Llangynwyd, 4, 17, 98, 104, 158, 190.
Llanhir, 209.
Llanidloes, 243 (n. 5).
Llanigon, 80, 130, 133, 137, 154, 201, 213.
Llannon (Carm.), 156.
Llannor, 26, 131, 145.
Llannordineio, 132, 138, 142.
Llanrhaiadr Mochnant, 3, 119.
Llanrhychwyn, 27.
Llanrwst, 27, 28 (n. 1).
Llansantffraid ym Mechain, 17.
—— Glyn Ceiriog, 148.
Llanstephan, 103, 123, 157.
Llantarnam, 17, 106.
Llanthetty, 16, 98, 161.
Llantilio Pertholy, 37, 160, 228.
Llantrisant (Glam.), 2, 6, 200.
—— (Mon.), 98, 160, 233.
Llantrithyd, 2.
Llanwddyn, 10, 243 (n. 5).
Llanwenarth, 42, 45, 80, 160, 202.
Lleuar, 12.
Lleyn, 18, 19, 134-136, 226.
Llwynrhys, 156.
Llywel, 14.

M

Machynlleth, 130.
Maenllwyd, 145.
Maesmynus, 98.
Magor, 37, 43, 98, 160, 172.
Mansfield, 83.
Marchwiel, 240.
Margam, 158, 159, 250.
Margaretting, 86.
Marshfield (Glouc.), 165, 167.
Marshfield (Mon.), 116, 160, 230.
Marton, 87, 125.
Matlock, 31.
Merthyr (Carm.), 98, 155.
Merthyr Tydvil, 12, 37, 44, 47, 51, 158, 233-234, 235.
Methlan, 130, 134.
Meyllteyrn, 133, 137.
Milford, Salop, 163.
Mitcheldean, 105.
Montgomery (co.), 97, 243.
Montgomery (town), 13, 199.
Mortlake, 182.
Morton, 163.
Moston, 125.
Much Wenlock, 126, 141, 163.
Mydrim, 4, 98, 102, 229.
Mynyddislwyn, 42, 45, 160, 189, 224.

N

Nanhoron, 130, 136-137, 234.
Nant (by Oswestry), 163, 165 (n. 2).
Nantglyn, 148.
Nantwich, 163, 165.
Nayland, Suff., 191.
Neath, 31, 158.
Netherwent, 42, 43, 44, 120.
Newchapel, Mont., 6, 47.
Newport, Mon., 92, 98, 115, 116, 160, 237-238.
New Radnor, 98, 162, 170, 204, 232.
Newton Nottage, 45, 80, 98, 158, 227, 228, 231.
Newtown, 98, 151.
Nicholaston, 103, 158.
Norwich, 83.
Nottingham, 191.
Nympsfield, 155.

O

Old Radnor, 162.
Orleton, 241.
Oswestry, 3, 27, 51, 92, 99, 141, 147, 163, 164-165.
Overton, 14.
Oxford (city), 126, 218.

P

Parc y Pill, 106.
Pencader, 103, 123, 157.
Pencarreg, 86, 98, 115, 116.
Peniarth, 149.
Penmorfa, 135.
Pennepec, 214, 215.
Pentyrch, Eifionydd, 144.
Penyrallt, 146.
Plas Têg, 75, 76, 95, 108, 149.
Porteynon, 98, 103, 158.
Portskewet, 18, 20.
Portsmouth, 74.
Pwllheli, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 138.

R

Raglan, 22, 57.
Reading, 165, 168.
Redwick, 232 (n. 3).
Rhayader, 211.
Rhossilly, 103, 158.
Rhydwilym, 38, 95, 197, 214, 215.
Romford, 112.
Raubon, 11, 79, 115, 146.
Ruardean, 78.
Ruthin, 20, 79, 146.

S

Salt Stone Rock, 85.
Shirenewton, 44, 118, 160, 200, 231, 235.
Shrewsbury, 163.
Slebech, 80.
Stoak-in-Wirral, 26.
Sunningwell, 128.
Swansea, 40, 82, 92, 93, 98, 101, 103, 115, 158, 170, 172, 224.
Sweeney, 125, 163, 164.

T

Talgarth, 122, 123, 130, 137, 154.
Tamworth, 187.
Taunton, 43, 85, 179, 191.
Tenby, 20, 171.
Tettenhall, 83.
Tilstock, 164.
Tonge, 88.
Trecastell, 214.
Trefalun, 232.
Trefriw, 27.
Tretower, 154.
Trygarn, 130, 132.
Ty'nycoed, Llangian, 130, 144, 145.

U

Undy, 21, 128, 160.
Usk (Priory), 106.
Uzmaston, 79, 104, 161, 190, 229.

V

Vaynor 98, 159.

W

Walsham, 126.
Welshpool, 16, 98, 151, 190.
Wem, 242.
Wenvoe, 98, 158, 192, 234-235.
Westbury, 129.
Weston, Salop, 99, 163.
Whitchurch (Glam.), 199, 227.
Whitchurch (Salop), 31, 125.
Whitford, 22.
Whitwell, 240.
Wickham Bishops, 120.
Wilcrick, 44.
Wimblimglym, 79, 146.
Witnesham, 239 (n. 1).
Worthenbury, 8, 31, 53, 98.
Wrexham, 22, 92, 114, 120, 121, 122, 124, 125, 146, 147, 174, 175, 194, 223.

Y

Yin y Crie, 144-145.
Ynys y Creua, 145 (n. 1).
Ysgafell, 33, 203.
Ystradwalter, 172.

WESTERN MAIL LIMITED, CARDIFF AND LONDON.—5679M.